The Churchman.

VOLUME XVII. No. 27. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii.—15. WHOLE NUMBER, 359.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1847. AT NO. 12 JOHN STREET.

From the Churchman of March 22d, 1845.

Mr. Editor,—The Protestant Churchman, of the 8th of March, which has just met my eye, disposes of my remarks on the *ex post facto* application of the Canon of 1844 to the case of Bishop Onderdonk, with the flippancy with which it is not unusual to dispose of objections which cannot be answered. If the Editor did not comprehend them, he should have had decency enough to say nothing about them, or to say what he did say in a manner that would not have disgraced the name of a religious journal.

That a Canon which punishes an act in a way in which it was not punishable by law when it was committed, is *ex post facto*, unjust and immoral, seems not to be questioned. A Canon that purports or professes to do this, it seems also to be admitted, is void. A sentence that so interprets a Canon as to give it this effect, it must also be admitted is void.

How happens it then, that the sentence pronounced against Bishop Onderdonk, is not liable to this objection? The Canon that inflicts suspension, was passed in 1844, and no Canon inflicting that punishment upon a Bishop, was ever before enacted in this Church. The sentence applies it to an offence in 1837, when there was no Canon directing it to be so punished. By what law has Bishop Onderdonk been punished? The act, if it was an immorality, was no doubt proscribed by the moral law: but what law institutes the *punishment* that has been inflicted? Is it a law that existed in 1837? Was the offence punishable by suspension at that time? Or is that punishment first authorized in such a case by the Canon of 1844?

Now listen to the answer that is given to these questions by the Editor of the Protestant Churchman:—"Had Bishop Onderdonk been tried and convicted for infringing some merely technical regulation prescribed by a Canon passed after the offence, no tribunal could have been found to convict him: but the law under which he was tried was of no ex post facto enactment: it is coeval with the world: it is the eternal law of right and wrong, the law of purity and sound morals; and never have we known its dignity and essential character so awfully misunderstood as in this puerile attempt to confine its powerr, influence and prerogative within the limits of human legislation."

These are brave words—something more brave than intelligible,—though this is not the place to inquire what is meant by claiming to extend the "power, influence, and prerogative of the law of purity and sound morals beyond the limits of human legislation." But the question being whether the *punishment* was not *ex post facto*, the answer is given that it is not, because the law under which the Bishop *was tried*, "is coeval with the world—is the eternal law of right and wrong—the law of purity and sound morals!" Now is it not supreme impudence in such a writer to tax an objection with puerility, when he does not comprehend it, nor even his own answer to it, nor perceive that the answer has nothing to do with the objection? The objection is that the Bishop is punished with the ex post facto punishment of *suspension* ordained by the Canon; and the answer is gravely given, that it is not an ex post facto law, "but the eternal law of right and wrong," namely, that *suspension should be the punishment!* Who doubts that immorality has always been an offence by the eternal law of right and wrong? Who has said any thing to the contrary? Who denies the right or the duty of the Church to pass a Canon ordering it to be punished with that punishment which she deems appropriate, consistently with the laws of the land? Who questions her right to have passed such a law on the very first day that her Convention ever met? Who denies the right of her first Convention to enact, that if ministers gave themselves to drinking and riot, they should be liable to admonition, suspension, or degradation, as the nature of the case might require? Who questions the right of the Convention to make a like provision in 1829 for punishing with admonition, suspension, or degradation, the whole circle of scandalous, disorderly or immoral conduct by ministers, the violation of the Canons, or the preaching, or inculcating heretical doctrine? Or finally, who disputes the power of the Convention in 1832, to apply these specific punishments to "any crime or gross immorality, disorderly conduct, drunkenness, profane swearing,"&c.? None of these Canons prescribed a mode of trial. They annexed a specific punishment to certain offences, that were so, by the "eternal law of right and wrong," and they did nothing more. To what purpose did they do all this, if both the offence and the punishment existed before by the same eternal law? The question concerns the *punishment* which was first instituted in the case of Bishops by the Canon of 1844, and not the *immorality* to which it is applied. Let the Protestant Churchman try his hand at meeting the objection to the *punishment* ex post facto, and lay aside his grandiloquent strain about "the power, influence, and prerogative of the law of purity and sound morals."

Perhaps the Editor thinks that he does meet it by saying that "the Canons of 1841, and 1844, declared no new offences, and prescribed no new punishment; they merely provided the mode of trying the members of the Church (Bishops meaning) for offences at all times denounced by the Church." But it is not enough to say this, for it is the very point in dispute. The Canon of 1841 did not prescribe any form of punishment. The Canon of 1844 does prescribe a punishment never before prescribed by the Church for the offences by bishops which it enumerates, some of which are immoral offences and some are not, or may not be. It is a new punishment of offences by bishops in our Code of Canons. How does it appear that it is not a new punishment of those offences, in every lawful view of the case? This is the point to which attention should have been given, without attempting to escape it in a cloud of words. All that the Canon provides, says the Editor, is "the mode of trying the members of the Church for offences at all times denounced by the Church." This is not true. It prescribes *specific punishments* for those offences by bishops. If by *denouncing* them he means that the Church has always *so punished* them, without any Canon to that effect, let him endeavor to prove it. What Church has so punished them without a Canon? Certainly not the Church in the United States. She never attempted so to punish them, as bishops, until the Canon of 1844. What other Church has done it? Let us hear the name of the Church and let us see whether the punishment has been inflicted before it was prescribed by a Canon. The point objected is that the punishment by suspension of a bishop *is new in this Church*. If it is, the quotation from Chancellor Kent saves all further argument. The Canon is ex post facto if it was intended to "render the act punishable in a manner in which it was not punishable when it was committed;" and the sentence is ex post facto if it has so applied the Canon, whether the Convention so intended it or not.

If the Editor holds that the Canons of 1789 and 1829 and 1832, when they speak of *members*, include *bishops*—or that the Canons of other Churches punishing bishops by admonition, suspension, or deposition, bind this Church—or that the tribunals constituted by the Convention of this Church, have authority to punish moral offences, where there is no Canon annexing a punishment, let him say so, and then it may be hoped that the question, being fairly stated, will be intelligibly argued. What does morality gain, what does the Church gain, by holding what the course of legislation in the Church negatives? A present purpose it is true has been gained, but a general purpose has been defeated. The general purpose in all penal legislation is certainty. Make the law and prescribe the punishment as you deem expedient, and let it be essential in the cases to which it lawfully applies. The Convention has made such laws repeatedly, upon the ground that they are necessary in regard to moral offences, as in regard to the infringement of what the Editor calls "technical canonical regulations." Establish the position that it is unnecessary in regard to moral offences, and then not only are the Canons prescribing specific punishments for such offences useless, but for a moral offence of any grade, committed at any time, a Bishop may not only inflict upon his clergy any of the three punishments, admonition, suspension, or degradation, but it will require a Canon to prevent his inflicting any sort of censure that has ever been adopted in any Church, if he thinks it more appropriate or effectual. For the future every class of moral offence by members or bishops is now provided for by canonical punishment. What does the cause of justice or immorality profit by punishing a previous act under a subsequent Canon, at the expense of the principle that in the Church as well as in the State, an offender is to be punished only according to the law? If a Canon prescribing a punishment for a moral offence is unnecessary, upon what principle is it necessary for trying the offender? Nova Cæsaræa.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

REVIEW OF THE TRIAL OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

NUMBER FIVE.

The case of Mrs. Beare seems to me to be the only portion of the evidence brought against Dr. Onderdonk worthy of serious consideration, *even at the time of the alleged occurrence*. The others are so remote in time, and so utterly unsupported by consistent, rational, and satisfactory proof, that I cannot conceive that they would ever have been brought into the case except, as mere makeweight, to help out, *in the public mind*, some circumstances, in the case of Mrs. Beare, which would otherwise appear inconsistent. But on the part of Bishop Onderdonk, it seems to me that he has just ground of complaint, that they should be made use of for any such purpose. If he is to be treated with that consideration due to one accused of crime in the secular courts, no such testimony could be adduced. Each charge must be distinctly alleged, and definitely proved. And the prosecuting officer, in a secular tribunal, would not be permitted to group together in one indictment charges of similar offences even, committed against different persons.

I think, therefore, we have a right to consider the case of Mrs. Beare by itself, and as being the *only* evidence against the Bishop. And it does seem to me that there are many circumstances connected with this transaction, also, greatly calculated to induce in the mind an apprehension that it was somewhat exaggerated, to say the least. I am aware that this is a case which might strike some minds very differently. Those who are predisposed to suspect all men, or all clergymen, of indulging lewd or lustful feelings upon all occasions, or upon all occasions not positively forbidding any such impulse in one not wholly brutalized, will, I know, find much in this portion of the testimony to convince them of the Bishop's guilt. But such persons have yet very much to learn upon this subject. And in presuming to judge others altogether upon their own short experience, whether personal or the result of the observation of others communicated to them, they act a very rash and a very unjust part. These things, in men even, and especially in women, are very much under the influence of habit; and such passions are produced, in the first instance, almost altogether, by indulgence, and are kept in active operation only in the same manner; while by an opposite course they become indifferent, or almost extinguished. So that a person in one of these extreme states, either of activity or inactivity, of this peculiar stimulus, is almost incapable of forming any just judgment of the conduct of others, who, from constitutional temperament, habit, age, or infirmity, are upon the opposite extreme. Hence it has always seemed to me far wiser, and better in every respect, in regard to these matters, not to be too suspicious, too confident of guilt, upon slight evidence. There is no subject, perhaps, which more justly calls for the exercise of charity; none, when it is in general, less likely to be exercised. Upon this subject all men, and almost all others, have a theory—a theory of their own—and, like most other theories, it will not bear bending much; and possesses, also, like all other things, a wonderful character of infallibility. And if it is charitable to conclude that, upon this as well as other subjects, men judge others by themselves, then, I think, we must conclude that most of all the human family are indeed, in the language of Sallust, *prona natura ac veluti pecudes*. But I suppose it will be admitted there *may be* excebtions here, also, as there are always some exceptions to all rules.—How then can we be confident of the guilt of any one accused of an equivocal act of this character, as some of those in this case certainly were? How is it possible to say that Bishop Onderdonk *might not* have been, indeed that he *probably was* not perfectly innocent in the "familiarities" which Mrs. Beare objected against him, as having occurred in the return from Church in the morning, or during the interval between the services. Her suspicions and disgust were excited at the first. She was then, of course, prepared to make the most of what did occur. And what does she say that was? Why—"The Bishop put his arm around me in an *unbecoming* manner, *which caused me to draw from him.*" I suppose the Bishop is not more or less guilty on account of what his conduct caused others to do, unless *he* gave just occasion for such conduct. This case, then, which did excite Mrs. B's apprehension, so that she refused to ride with him, in the afternoon, to Church, when stripped of her conduct and the epithet "unbecoming," which is of course merely her judgment of the matter, diminishes almost to a point. The Bishop put his arm around her, in the carriage, and she *afterwards* believed, or fancied, that his "hand pressed upon her bosom." This, again, is a matter of which she *might think* very much more than the Bishop. But, at all events, she saw fit to take offence. She forthwith communicates the offence, and her suspicion of the Bishop's impurity, to her husband. She is then committed, to make out a case against the Bishop. This pitiable shred of a suspicion might operate more against herself than the Bishop if it stood alone. Well, instead of putting the Bishop at an unapproachable distance, as most women would have done under such circumstances as she considered herself placed in, she suffers the Bishop "to raise her head by her chin, and kiss her," and "to put his arm around her," which was all well enough, if simply intended, and received, as a parental caress, which an aged Christian Bishop might, perhaps, properly enough extend to the children of his charge—certainly it should not subject him to the imputation of impurity, unless upon some more distinct proof than what is inferible from the act itself. But Mrs. Beare did, at the time, consider it as an act of *too great* familiarity, and as proceeding from improper feelings, it would seem. What then must we think of her delicacy and discretion in submitting to such familiarities, merely because her husband wished her not to let it alter her manner towards the Bishop. She is certainly putting a very liberal construction upon her husband's request, which he evidently made because he, at that time, did not credit his wife's suspicions of the Bishop. She doubtless understood the feeling of her husband, although perhaps he did so express himself to her. Is it supposable, then, that Mr. Beare, by that request, is to be understood as desiring his wife to submit patiently and meekly to the further insults and impure approaches of the Bishop? Surely not. He did not view them in that light, and his wife so understood him. She had therefore to sustain her own views, which was most of all important, and she was committed to make out a case against Bishop Onderdonk, that should satisfy her husband, that he was not the pure, perfect man he had always considered him. She must be consistent, in her husband's presence, at least. She would not therefore ride with the Bishop, in the afternoon, even to *keep up appearances* of cordiality—but she *had* submitted, during the interval, to his rude and impure familiarities, *as she considered them*, not an hour before, *to please her husband*, and *keep up appearances!*

The next case then, which she brings against the Bishop, is wholly of a different character; one which to most minds, admits of no charitable construction of its motives. The case is, in my judgment, wholly decisive of Bishop Onderdonk's unfitness for his office, if it gains credit to the full extent. It was therefore, in this respect, such a case as one would expect to come from one so circumstanced as Mrs. Beare was, if she was sufficiently unscrupulous to fabricate or even to embellish and enlarge a transaction, in order to make out her case. That this is sometimes done by persons, *when pressed* and driven into straits, and even by those, who, in the ordinary transactions of life, when the course of events is quiet, and the waters calm, are regarded as perfectly truthful and conscientious, all persons much experienced in the trials of matters of fact, in courts of justice, have had the means of often witnessing, often to their great astonishment and sorrow. I need not say to those at all experienced in such matters, that *such an occurrence* is ten times more notable, than that Bishop Onderdonk should have been guilty of all which Mrs. Beare charges against him, under the circumstances alleged, and of her subsequent conduct in the matter. And of two improbabilities, we are at all times bound to choose the least, and especially so in a case where crime is alleged, against all reasonable probability.

We suppose, as no limitation was fixed in regard to the date of charges prefered against the Bishop, we are to conclude that the Presentment includes all which could be found in the course of his whole life, and that, I believe, is pretty distinctly understood to be the admitted fact, both by foes and friends. That being so, and all the others being disproved upon the trial or subsequently, as we have seen, or else too absurd to claim belief, we are to consider that Bishop Onderdonk was wholly innocent of any such offence up to that moment. How very strange—how passing strange, that he should have then, thus late in life, after a quarter of a century and more of exemplary purity, holding the office of Bishop in the largest diocese in America, surrounded by friends, beloved and respected by all who knew him, (and who did not hate him for his views of Church doctrine and Church polity,) the confidential guest of one of his clergy, then being conveyed to his quiet rest, after a day of double duty, upon the Sabbath, in the same carriage with both husband and wife, to whom in bonds of Christian charity and honor he was little less bound than to his own children: that at such a time he should, for the first time in his life, have committed such senseless and motiveless indignities, will not gain credit with the disinterested and discriminating; and to those whose minds possess neither of these qualities, no absurd calumny is to gross for their credulity. What *could* have been the expectation of the Bishop, if Mrs. Beare had not encouraged these familiarities, which we are of course to believe, or we cannot believe any portion of her testimony? Must he not have *expected*, of course, that she would make an outcry upon the spot? *Should* she not have done it? Is there any possible reason assigned to the present hour, why she did not do it? Bishop Onderdonk may be so constituted that he derives pleasure from *thrusting his hands rudely* into the bosom of the wives and daughters of *his friends*; but if that be so, he must be denominated *rosa avis in terris*. I never knew any such man. I do not believe it of him in this case. One thing is certain to my mind. Either Mrs. Beare *did encourage* the Bishop's familiarities, and thus virtually *seduce* him, which is not pretended; or else she has either fabricated the last transaction which she details; or what is the same, grossly exaggerated it, so as to make a great deal of nothing.

That I am not uncharitable to this witness without cause, might be shown by numerous considerations, some of which have been alluded to, and others will be found in the frank, cordial and friendly manner in which both herself and her husband are proved, on many, indeed all subsequent occasions of their meeting the Bishop, to have received and treated him. These, indeed, this witness denies, but they are fully proved by other witnesses, so numerous and of such a character, as to leave no manner of doubt of the facts.

This witness did, too, according to her own subsequent admission, expressly declare one fact upon oath, which was wholly false, and without the least foundation of truth, *or of honest belief in her own mind* at the time, of its being true. She simply and unequivocally declared, that a certain paper containing memorandums of the testimonies testified to by her, made by herself, had been destroyed by her; and this declaration she must have made to get rid of the subject on cross-examination; and then, not five minutes after, is compelled to admit that she left the paper at home, and had no knowledge, or reason to believe, that it had been destroyed. If then, we apply to this witness the well-known maxim of the law, *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*, her testimony must be laid out of the case, on that ground also.

There only then remains the testimony in regard to the Bishop's admissions, made to Mr. Beare. Here it will not be pretended, that any distinct admissions were made by the Bishop, except to admit, that *his charge of falsehood and impurity*, brought against Mrs. Beare at the former interview had with him on this subject, might not be well founded. He then said Mrs. Beare "*was mistaken.*" He was anxious to "soothe" Mr. Beare, as all admit Mr. Beare was excited, but not on account of the indignities offered his wife, so much as her being charged with falsehood. The Bishop waived this charge. With this Mr. Beare was satisfied; the Bishop still protesting his own perfect innocence; and that Mrs. Beare was wholly "mistaken." This, then, could hardly be construed an admission of the facts charged by Mrs. Beare. Certainly no further than they were *distinctly made known* to the Bishop. And upon *this point*, it seems to me the whole mistake, as to the Bishop's admissions of this charge, rests. There is no pretence that Dr. Milnor *attempted* to state the *particulars* of the facts. That was left to Dr. Muhlenburg. This he *attempted*, and no doubt thought he had succeeded in doing understandingly; but he was "*embarrassed*" and "*confused*," and there is no good reason to believe that the Bishop supposed at the time, that Mrs. Beare alleged that he had done more than to put his hand *upon* her bosom, which *he* would of course understand, to import the *outside* of her dress—which might be done either innocently or otherwise, according to the motive and feeling with which it was done. And his denial the day before, and on that day, must be understood, of the motive, the *impulse feeling*, which would seem to be a very absurd denial, contemporaneously with an *admission*, that he was guilty of the *acts now testified to by Mrs. B.*

Under all the testimony in the case upon this point, it seems to me a forced and unnatural construction, to say that the Bishop on that occasion *admitted more* than this; or that he was *understood to admit more*. If this had been so, such men as those who were then about him could hardly have consented to "let the matter drop," as they did formerly agree to do, if they had considered the Bishop as making any definite *admission* in regard to *these acts which admitted of no excuse or palliation*. This they could not have done, it seems to me, without seriously compromising their own characters, which so many men would not be likely to do from any false apprehension of consequences to themselves; and they were not the class of men who would be suspected of connivance with the Bishop. The truth undoubtedly was, that they considered the charges not well substantiated against the Bishop. And although some of them might have suspected the Bishop of too careless, undignified an air of freedom to suit the character of his office, as is inferable from Dr. Milnor's caution to him at parting, there certainly is no good reason to believe, that any of them present considered the testimony as fairly entitled to more credit than this. And this undoubtedly is all there is in this part of the case. I have then only to say a few words in conclusion, in regard to the influences which brought this trial about, and the considerations which operated to produce the result, and I have done.

I am not disposed to question the sincerity of those who brought about this trial, much less would I impeach the perfect integrity of the judges. Men, the best of men—all of us, in looking back upon our conduct for a few years, find sad reason to question the wisdom of their own conclusions, or the perfect disinterestedness of our feelings and judgments, upon almost all subjects. These things prove in the end with all men, especially with those of decided character and feeling, to be so much under the influence of temperament, passion, or prejudice, that we never feel safe in the hands of any one, unless after the fullest trial of his purity and power of dislodging his mind, altogether from the bonds of interest and feeling, which so very few men can do. In proof of this I have alluded to the cases of impeachment which have been voted by the United States House of Representatives against two different judges, and tried before the most august body of men known to our secular administration, the Senate of the United States, where, nevertheless, everything almost was decided by a strictly party vote! One or two men, the Hon. Israel Smith of the Senate, from the State of Vermont, upon the trial of Judge Chase, and Gov. Tazewell of Virginia, I think, in the trial of Judge Peck, with one or two others possibly, breaking through the shackles of party ties. And thus to their great credit, they saved from ruinous disgrace and civil death, two men who are now universally esteemed men of perfect purity of intention, whatever may be thought of their moderation, wisdom, or discretion. This almost miraculous departure from party influence, of these few men, and the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote, to convict upon articles of impeachment, was all that saved these deserving public servants from disgrace and absolute ruin. The vote too, in regard to the conviction and sentence of Bishop Onderdonk, shows the same thing, an unflinching adherence to supposed party lines. This, then, at the most, was a *party trial* and a *party conviction*. Ought it then to be regarded as at all conclusive of the matter in controversy? Have such verdicts and judgments, brought about by such influences, ever been regarded as of any force? Has the public mind ever rested upon them, as a safe ground of reliance? Is Queen Elizabeth any more esteemed innocent of the unjust death of Mary Queen of Scots, because of the trial and conviction, to which that unfortunate if not guilty princess was subjected in a foreign land, without the power to know the fairness of her triers, or the honesty of those who gave testimony against her? Are Latimer and Ridley, and a host of others worthy and glorious sons of the Church, who have laid down their lives in defence of its laws and its doctrines, esteemed any the less martyrs of that noble army, because, forsooth, they had a trial, and were duly, yes duly and formally convicted, each and all of the awful crime of heresy? Think ye that in the last great day of account, Bradshaw and his associates, who sat in judgment upon their lawful sovereign, and condemned him to an ignominious death upon the scaffold, will go acquit, because they *thought*, indeed, they were doing God service? And does the page of impartial Church history any the less record the name of Charles among her noble army of martyrs, because of the mockery of that regicide court, which sat for days and nights to find evidence, upon which to justify a judgment, already predetermined, before that court convened. And was not the Saviour of mankind tried before the Roman Governor, and did not many witnesses rise up against him, yea false witnesses? and at last was he not fully *condemned*, and *scourged*, and *crucified, in accordance with that sentence?* But do these men reflect, that in that way all the good, the uncompromising, in short all who withstand evil influences, and stand firm when peril and tribulation come upon us, may be decimated from our ranks, and the Church fall a prey to the worldly minded, the unscrupulous, and the heartless. Let us away with such counsellors, and set to our seal that God is true, *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*. And has it not always been thus in the Church? Have not all her glorious company of martyrs, confessors, and bishops, who have suffered in life, or unto death—have they not, one and all, been subjected to these causeless inflictions, at the hands of *judges*, and *tormentors*, and *executioners*, who *professed*, and very likely in most cases, in all sincerity, to be but the instruments of the law, and of justice. In conclusion, I have only to say that I trust it has been made apparent to some minds, that Bishop Onderdonk has been badly dealt with. This has been done chiefly, perhaps, through the agency of two classes of men in the Church.

1. Those, who themselves live *purely* only by the most constant warfare with the world, the flesh, and the devil, and who cannot comprehend how others should contend so *strictly* as they do for this end; and who therefore *believe* that Bishop Onderdonk did yield to these temptations, which themselves escaped, so as by fire.

2. Those who live purely themselves, and make no great doubt that Bishop Onderdonk did also, who are in reality seduced by the senseless cry of the worldly and ungodly host, which beset always the Church from without, and who preach *expediency*, in the language of Caiphas, that it is better that a "suspected man" should suffer *unjustly*, than that the Church should suffer through him!

July, 1847. R. F. I.

For the Churchman.

Dear Mr. Editor,—The following editorial scrap from the Episcopal Recorder of the 14th inst. will show upon what arguments the enemies of Bishop Onderdonk rely to prevent any favorable action on his case at the next General Convention—

"New York.—The New York Churchman has opened the whole subject of the Onderdonk case again. Its disgusting details are once more paraded before an outraged Church, and nauseated public. It is evident that an insane attempt is to be made to have this wretched man restored to the duties of the Episcopate. We call it insane, not that we desire to use language that can be considered harsh [O no!] towards those who are engaged in the humiliating effort, but simply to characterize our own impression of the object at which they aim. The undertaking appears to us to be as ill judged, and we trust also, that it will be found as hopeless, as if it had its origin in Bedlam. Of course this movement begins with a regular attack upon the majority of the Court. If consummated, it must be by substantially trying and condemning fourteen Bishops, instead of one. The attempt is preposterous."

In his article, last week, he blasphemously attributes the trial and conviction of Bishop Onderdonk to *Divine agency!* of course it becomes exceedingly impious to assail it.

While he censures the Churchman for examining the proceedings, he, with his usual want of fairness, keeps out of view the fact, that it was rendered necessary by the disgraceful attack of Dr. Anthon upon Bishop DeLancey, and by inference on the other Bishops who composed the minority. This would have been an unpalatable truth to set before his readers. Of course those Bishops deserve no quarter.

It is quite characteristic of the Editor to insult the fallen and miserable; compassion and forbearance have no place in his heart. Perhaps, however, Bishop Onderdonk is not quite as "*wretched*" as he would have him to be. It is true he is in a painful and humiliating position. He is prohibited from the discharge of his ministerial functions for an indefinite period, *if the sentence is valid*, which of itself is a most grievous calamity; and is made the object of opprobrium and scurrility to the unfeeling rabble. Yet he has the consciousness of innocence to sustain him, the consolations of religion, the sense of the righteous providence of God, who will redress his wrongs and manifest his righteousness, if not in this world, in the presence of an assembled universe when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed. These hopes and consolations the world, bitter and vindictive as it is, cannot take away; nor can his bitterest foes deprive him of them. He is not as wretched as the man whose heart is filled with malice and hatred, and whose pen drips continually with venom and gall, whose religion is hypocrisy, and whose piety is cant; whose mouth utters naught but deceit and slander; and whose very breath is pestiferous with the foul exhalations of falsehood. Such an one may with Pharisaical pride thank God that he is not as other men, and impose upon simple hearted people by his affectation and sanctity; but he is wretched and abhorred in the sight of an all-seeing God, who will render to him a meet recompense for his nefarious deeds, in that great day when he shall bring forth the righteousness of his oppressed servant as the light, and his judgment as the noon-day. I wish the enemies of Bishop Onderdonk to ponder these things, to search themselves, lest perchance there may be among them such a character as I have described, and impartially to consider, whether, supposing him to exist, he can justly censure any of his fellow men on the ground of his superior sanctity.

In the same number a correspondent, signed P., which I understand is a middle initial, has essayed strange flights. It is marked No. xii., whence we suppose that eleven have preceded it; and if they at all resembled the last, they must have exhibited a richer aggregation of matter than is ordinarily to be found, even in the Episcopal Recorder. The author's "eye in a fine frenzy rolling," beholds unutterable visions of terror and consternation, and he exclaims, "And is not our Church at this day in a most perilous state? To what a momentous crisis have we arrived! Shall the dark clouds which now spread far and wide over our ecclesiastical heavens completely cover us? Is a long night of ignorance, superstition and corruption about to settle upon us? Are we, professedly Christ's freemen, soon to become poor miserable serfs of Rome?"

Your readers will doubtless exclaim, What ails the poor fellow? What is he afraid of? I answer, High Churchmanship.

"The man who embraces high-church views of the ministry, the sacraments, or the Church, if he only has logic or moral courage enough, would be sure to end at Rome, were it not for the restraints of Providence. There is really no consistent point, no reasonable halfway stopping place between such high-church theology as Bishop Hobart's, for example, (and we mention this because less offensive than its kindred systems) and downright Popery."

And again—

"High-Churchmanship is essentially Popery. Puseyism and Romanism are merely increasing developments of the same radical evil, High-Churchmanship."

Now for the remedies proposed—

"Ought we not strenuously and perseveringly to endeavor to *bring up Puseyism and every other Romish error with which we are troubled, before our public bodies, that they may examine and condemn them?* We know indeed it was declared by the last General Convention that it had nothing to do with such matters; but we know also that multitudes all over our Church received this declaration with equal astonishment and grief. . . . But the case is not hopeless. . . . Even a General Convention may err. That body must yet look this matter fully in the face. Neither the cunning policy of the great adversary nor an unchristian timidity can always keep our troubles out of it."

Now this assertion is laughable enough, considering the many days that were consumed in discusing Memminger's and Empie's resolutions, and the wise resolve at last arrived at—

"That the House consider the Liturgy, Offices, and Articles of the Church sufficient exponents of her sense of the essential doctrines of Holy Scripture; and that the Canons of the Church afford ample means of discipline and correction for all who depart from her standards."

And also—

"That the General Convention is not a suitable tribunal for the trial and censure of, and that the Church is not responsible for, the errors of individuals, whether they are members of this Church or otherwise."

But our meek-spirited friend wants Puseyism, and every other Romish error, to be condemned by the General Convention; and as *High-Churchmanship is essentially Romish*, of course that is to be condemned also. Could some people have their way, an Ecclesiastical Reign of Terror would soon commence.

Again—

"Why have not all the *agents, principal* and *subordinate* in our late Popish ordinations, been called to account for these monstrous outrages against our Protestant Church? Let no one say hereafter, as has been said, 'Why bring up these troubles before our tribunals and public assemblies? Nothing can there be done against them.' How can we be certain of this till the experiment be thoroughly tried?"

It seems, then, that "our Popish ordinations" and the "agents" therein, are to be called to account, but how, when, or where, and what particular ordinations our erratic friend has in view, I am sure I cannot tell. Probably time will elucidate.

He also proposes "a *general correspondence* among all the friends of our Protestant faith throughout the Church," "to get ready for combined action [Ah! ah!] and also "just before the next General Convention *a meeting of those members who grieve over our present troubles*, that they may go into it prepared to act together wisely and efficiently; and not as it too often has been in times past, suffer themselves to be defeated by a crafty minority through their own want of mutual understanding and settled views in respect to the course which ought to be pursued. Such a meeting might also draw up and put forth a thoroughly digested *testimony* to the great truths of the Gospel now so obscured and endangered in many parts of our Zion; and a solemn *protest* against those popish errors which are daily spreading their poisonous influence all about us, and destroying immortal souls."

These *popish errors*, it must be remembered, are the *distinctive principles* of the Church as taught by Bishop Hobart and its standards—"its ministry, sacraments, holy days, and goodly order," &c. Your intelligent readers will mark the strictly Puritanical form of words employed above. Probably these pious souls will take the "solemn league and covenant" as the substratum of their "*testimony*." If it were generally adopted, it would effectually put down High Churchmen.

But the cream of the joke is yet to come, and it must be allowed of Mr. P. that there is "method in his madness."

"Another great duty devolves upon the friends of evangelical truth. Ought they not, with much and careful consultation, to prepare and publish a *revised* Book of Common Prayer? This idea was first suggested to us in a private letter from a distinguished Lay-member of our Church in one of the New England States: and it is certainly worthy of serious thought. There are too many, at least apparent, grounds for Popish errorists to stand upon in some parts of the Prayer Book. It is vain to deny this. Puseyites constantly appeal to these grouuds, and the friends of evangelical truth cannot here make a perfectly triumphant defence. Honesty is always the best policy. It is ever wise and right to acknowledge our errors and reform them. Rome's Bohan Upas has been permitted in times past to spread its poisonous snare [!!] over us, and what hope can we have of escaping its deadly influence, so long as we cherish its roots in our very soil? If we lop off its branches this year, they will shoot out again the next. We must go down to the bottom of our evils, and make thorough reformation work. Certainly this requires much wisdom, courage, and piety, but God will not withhold these if we seek him arightly; and if we do not, Rome must at last get entire dominion over us, and we as a Church of Christ be deservedly blotted out."

Here then, at length, we have the old Puritan cry of Popery in the Prayer Book, and *reformation, root and branch*. The most learned, pious, and dutiful of the Clergy have been branded with opprobious epithets, charged with every shape of heresy and false dealing, and proclaimed as traitors to the Church and her formularies—and now it comes out that those very formularies authorize their teaching, and that they too must be reformed. Are the intelligent, devout, and high-minded Laity who have been taught from their youth to love and revere their Prayer Book, prepared and willing to see it mangled and destroyed by the base hands of Puritan fanatics? Are they willing to unlearn those sacred truths taught by the Church Catholic for 1800 years, and submit their necks to the yoke of Ira Warren and the scribes of the Episcopal Recorder? Will they continue to vilify their spiritual pastors and teachers because they faithfully teach them the doctrine and the discipline of Christ *as this Church has received the same*, and as by their ordination vows they have solemnly promised to do? I believe the response will be a loud and unanimous No; I am confident that if the Puritan faction dare to tamper with the Book of Common Prayer, and present a *revised edition*, suited to their narrow and fanatical spirits, they will be hailed with such a shout of mocking and scorn that they will be glad to cast their idol to the owls and to the bats, and hide their diminished heads in shame and disgrace. We are told that if we retain the Prayer Book as it is, "Rome must at last get dominion over us, and we as a Church of Christ be deservedly blotted out." One might as well answer the raving of a maniac, as such miserable drivelling as this.

"But suppose," some will say, "that every effort should fail, that things go on from bad to worse, and the dark polluting stream of Romanism *continues* to roll its desolating waves over us, *what then shall be done?* There is but one course left—it is to *divide*. If you cannot reclaim unsound men, if you cannot put off their errors and corrupt practices, you must separate. There is no other alternative. . . . . Hence division is now quite frequently spoken of—and at times even in our high places—as that painful, solemn alternative to which both duty and safety will in all human probability soon shut us up."

Here is another development. If the Prayer Book cannot be altered in conformity with Puritan views, and High Churchmen cannot be exterminated, the Church must be divided. Exactly the same language is employed as was used by the Puritans in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and the result was their voluntary separation from the Church Catholic, and consequent excommunication by the Canons passed in the reign of James I., in 1603. The Puritan faction now in our Church will undergo the same fate, and we can very easily spare them. Whether they amalgamate with "dissenters," or form themselves into a separate body, as did the unhappy Dashiell and his deluded followers, we care not: the Church will be relieved of an intolerable nuisance, and then, united and firm in doctrine and discipline, will go on and prosper. The writer tells us that he held the same views *twenty years ago*, i. e. *long before the Oxford Tracts were written or Puseyism had been advocated.* This is at least honest. He hates the *distinctive doctrines* then advocated by Hobart, and Kemp, and Ravenscroft, and those other worthies whose names will be had in everlasting remembrance by every true son of the Church. He hates the Prayer Book because it teaches the Doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, Apostolical Succession, the Commemorative Sacrifice in the Eucharist, the necessity of good works, and a holy and religious life to salvation. He finds there no Lambeth Articles, but the glorious doctrine that Christ died for the sins of the *world*, and that all may obtain salvation on complying with the conditions of the Christian covenant. He has had the manliness to express his views, and expose the hidden wishes and machinations of his party; he does not use the mantle of lies nor the cloak of hypocrisy, and for this he should be praised. We wish the Editor of the Recorder would use the like candor.

MASTIX.

For the Churchman

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT.

NUMBER FIVE.

Mr. Editor,—In my last I spoke chiefly of the inadequate support of the Church in a pecuniary point of view, which characterises the present age, and distinguishes it from the past, and some of the evils resulting therefrom.

In the present article, (which I intended should be the last in the series) I shall speak of *the great* omission of the present age—I mean daily Public Worship.

It requires no small degree of effort and obstruction of one's self from the thoughts and feelings peculiar to the present, to place a right estimate upon this matter. We are so overgrown with mammon and worldliness, that we hardly know what religion means. Is it not so? Does it not mean, *in the popular estimation*, the belief of certain doctrines and the possession of certain feelings, about the precise nature of which there are wide differences of opinion? But is this the religion of God and the Bible? of Christianity and the only Church? No: religion is *duty*—DUTY—DUTY;—the giving up of one's self to the Lord, and the performance of those duties which God requires. But we have in the present age made a shift by which to serve both God and Mammon to be religious; have all the hopes, comforts, and emoluments of religion, and yet be as worldly as ease, wealth, fashion and folly may demand. We look upon the self-sacrifice and the devotion of the past as senseless superstition. Daily prayers, weekly communions, rising from our beds in the night to pray, are looked upon in some quarters as omens of a peculiarly alarming import.

It is strange—passing strange—that an age which has so little devotion should be so tremblingly afraid that some body will be devout and reverent overmuch. Mr. Editor, the adversary has been permitted to catch us asleep. He has got his notions and plans, to a most alarming extent, substituted in the place of true religion; and now, with all the cunning and malignity of which his Arch-fiendship is capable, he is striving to retain the advantage he has gained—to have his devices cried up as true religion—the genuine principles of Protestantism—and the truth itself decried under the name of whatever is baneful and of evil tendency. Baptismal regeneration is denied, that so the people may be suffered to remain his until they come to years of discretion. Then Universalism comes in by his most cunning contrivance, to catch and retain them as soon as their consciences and understandings make them feel the want of religion. The apostolic succession is denied, that so his servants may be viewed as ministers of Christ. Daily prayer and frequent Communion is denied as superstition, that so by any means the hold of religion upon them may be reduced to the slightest possible power, and all sorts of moral reform associations, temperance societies, &c., &c., are ingeniously got up, to do away as fast and as far as possible, all sense of the importance of religion, or to supply the inextinguishable want of religion by something which will only make those that receive it still more securely his. Oh! it is sad, inexpressibly sad, to consider the extent to which we run after the desires of our own hearts and the devices of the devil, and call it religion; and the followers of Christ, those who abide in the apostles' fellowship, and doctrines, and prayers, are denounced as the enemies of Christ, because they will not follow or be led by them.

Mr. Editor, the truth is very plain, if we have no interests or wishes to put something else in its place. It is as certain that Christ ordained baptism and the Lord's supper—that he appointed a ministry with powers of self-perpetuation, to instruct, guide, and govern all people that would be his—that he gave a form of prayer which he commanded us to use "when we pray"—as that he lived, or died, or rose again from the dead. It is as certain as the plainest axiom, too plain to be made more so by words or by arguments, that genuine piety, which is love to God, would lead us to place the highest possible value on these things—to reverence them with the greatest reverence and scrupulosity. But no; the sacraments are declared to be mere contrived forms, by no means essential—the apostolic succession is derided, and the Lord's prayer, out of the Church, is never repeated as he commanded it should be. Can such piety be genuine? Is it not rather the delusion which has been foisted in as a substitute?

Shutting all other considerations out of view, it is as certain from the Bible that God has instituted *one* Christ, and that all else that pretends to be Christian is Antichrist, as that there is but one God, and all worship addressed to any person or thing else is idolatry. But this Church is diminished into an invisibility—a non-entity—a nothing; and men are left to think as they please—do as they please, and demand that they shall be now acknowledged to possess the supereminence of sanctity, and at the last day, will assault the gates of heaven itself with their loud clamors, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us. But I am wandering and I return.

The first thing that will be required, doubtless, is, that we show in favor of daily public worship of God in the Church, that it is so written in the law. If it even be excused—if its obligation can be explained away or evaded—the conscience of the present age is clear. Men will stand as erect and hold their heads as high, as though its omission was expressly commanded.

Now all men—all whose opinions are worth a moment's regard—will admit that *if* people will come together—if they had piety enough to bring them together, twice a day to say their prayers and receive the declaration of the absolution of their sins, it would make or imply a cordial change for the better in a general tone of society.

Well, why shall we not? Oh, there are a thousand reasons: some can't spare the time; some can't afford to *dress up* so often, and some are afraid of Popery, or something else. The devil is cunning: he can furnish a reason to suit any class of customers.

It is a prime fact in this connection, that God did, by the hand of Moses, require a daily worship or service, to be performed at morning and evening. This is no mere conjecture, no mere inference. It is a plain matter of law and revelation. It is a positively commanded duty. Now it is a leading question, one that goes right to the heart of the matter—for whose benefit was this daily service ordained? Doubtless it was for the benefit of somebody. God does nothing in vain. Could the reception of the Lamb, the tenth deal of flour, and a fourth part of a hin of beaten oil, and the fourth part of a hin of wine, be of any possible use, or advantage, or benefit to God? It is impossible. The thought is blasphemy. The service then must have been appointed for the benefit of man; because the offering of these daily sacrifices was necessary to him. And if they were necessary for man then, I can see no reason why they are not now.

"But it will take so much time!" Well, it ought to take some time. You have too much now; at least you throw away too much—quite too much, on the world, the flesh and the devil. "The people will never do it." If the people won't obey God, they must expect His wrath. It is perfectly certain that He won't obey them. Democracy has not gone quite so far as that yet.

The intermission of daily prayer in any branch of the Church, or rather the opinion that such prayers are not a divine institution required by the law of God, is something new, and peculiar to "the present." It was unheard of in "the past." These men had not so much to do for themselves that they could find no time to devote to the service of God. But the vast increase in the fictitious wants—the failure of the increased amount of wealth to satisfy those wants—the acquired appetites that grow with what they feed upon, and are never satiated, have wrought great changes. The growing world-livers of late years have kept steadily crowding religion more and more out of the world. The best of us have become familiarized, and quite at ease, in a condition that would have alarmed our ancestors of few generations past, for the safety of our souls. One pious usage after another has been gradually omitted; one principle of practical religion after another has been dropped from the popular opinions on the subject, until they have become to be considered as unnecessary, or denied as untrue, and we have in fact, "almost no religion" left. Christianity, in the popular estimation, has come to be but little if anything more than a mere pretence—a mere profession—a mere make-believe, assumed of a Sunday. And we wonder that we are not as content, as happy, and as prosperous, as in days that are among "the past," when they enjoyed none of the advantages and wonderful facilities of "the present."

But dear brethren, quiet, content, happiness, prosperity—the only prosperity that is not really an adversity—come from God, and are bestowed only on those that love Him and serve Him with some good degree of respect for His laws: democracy, republican institutions, schools, education of the young, and advancement of science, can accomplish no such result for you. Had we but faith like a grain of mustard seed, we should see that a Church regularly open for daily service at morning and evening, and *well attended*, in any village, would do incomparably more for the real solid good of that community, than all the schools that could be established, helped on as far as they might be by temperance societies, moral reform associations, and every other hopeful delusion of "the present" age.

"But oh no! we can't spare so much time as going to Church twice a day would require." Well, then, you must make up your minds to get along as best you can, relying on your own resources. If you can contend with the Almighty—if you can do more for yourselves in the hour which His services would require, than His blessing can bestow, then you are wise in the course you are taking. You had best to husband well your time, to use every spare moment, go to the grave unprepared, and at the bar of eternal judgment offer in excuse for having neglected God's service, that you had so much to do for yourself that you could not get time to serve Him.

Doubtless the world has a strong hold upon us all, and it will not relax that hold until we burst it with violence, and extricate ourselves from its thraldom. "The Prince of this world" will never allow the true followers of Christ to have a very easy time in it; and the truer they are the harder it will be for them, until they equal him in the enmity they endure from it. If we trust to it to carry us along, it will carry us, but not to the haven where we would be.

I cannot undertake to specify all the advantages that would result from daily prayer. It is enough to say that it is the institution and will of God; and if we have one spark of genuine faith left, we must know that it would be better for us to observe that institution and obey that will, than to neglect and disobey them.

One objection only will I notice. It is said that the clergy, one in a parish, would be incapable of the labor of daily public prayers. To this I say, let us have more, then. Let us give one-tenth of our income for religious purposes, and there would be enough in the treasury of the Lord to sustain as many clergy as would be necessary for all the duties that God requires of them. But again, I have been something of an invalid myself for the five years past, and I have never found anything that I could do so conducive to the improvement of my health, as the daily performance of the service which the Church has provided to be daily used. And I have no doubt others would find the same benefit in it.

I suppose that if we come to the right of the thing, a Church or parish never ought to be left with one clergyman alone. We find no precedent for it in the New Testament. Paul and Barnabas ordained elders "in every Church, on their apostolic journey. Titus was to ordain elders" in every city in Crete—not an elder in every Church or city, but elders—not one, but several. There were elders in the Church at Jerusalem; and St. Paul salutes the ministers of the order in the Church at Philippi in the plural number, as many, and not one only.

If now several ministers were necessary whenever the service of God was appointed to be offered in the apostolic days, I see not how a less number can be sufficient now. Many of those Churches just referred to, doubtless were not larger than our ordinary parishes, and the difficulty of supporting them then was no less than it would be now, if people were as willing now as they were then. If our young men were not hurried into parochial cares before they were old enough for them, and if our infirm and aged men were not compelled to labor on when they are too old and infirm to do so, there would always be enough of one or the other of these two classes, with one able bodied man, to sustain the services of the sanctuary up to the full extent of the divine requirements. But this, by the way.

Our religion in "the present" age is, to a very great extent, talk and profession. At least it is too speculative, too much in the head, too little in the heart. We have been for a long time contriving to have it take as little time as possible. We have too much to do to give ourselves up to the service of God; and genuine piety has given place to religious speculation and revival excitements. We forget, and then deny that to serve God is the great end of our being here, and our only employment in heaven, and that therefore it is no matter what else we omit if this be duly attended to.

I admit, then, fully and cheerfully, that daily prayers duly observed, would take up a great deal of our time in our own personal attendance upon them, and a great deal of our money in supporting those who shall duly perform such prayers. And this is precisely what we want, to make our religion a reality—to restore harmony to our views of life—to diminish our worldlines, and increase our godliness—to restore piety in the place of speculation—and to make us meek, humble, patient, forbearing, content with our condition, instead of ambitious, envious, brawling disputers, secret whisperers, and venomous back-biters. The fruits of religion will never come by talking about them. Nay—even though we have a forty days protracted meeting—and talk and hear about them in at least three sermons in the day, with anxious seats and enquiry meetings in the evening—those fruits will not appear. No; we must do something. We must do our duty. We must do and not simply hear about religion. We must deny ourselves, that is, shake off our sloth—relinquish our plans of worldly grandeur—and go daily to God's house and perform our duty there—adopt His law for our guide, His glory for our chief object of pursuit—and then we shall "*have religion*:" and it will manifest itself in charity, meekness, humility, forbearance, forgiveness of injuries, content with our condition and with what we have, in honor prefering one another. Then religion will be seen and felt to be a reality; no mere pretence—no mere make-believe—no mere cant or smooth-tongued hypocrisy. We shall be in earnest in pursuit of a reality, and we shall find it.

But any attempt to restore the good times of the past, which does not contemplate or include the restoration of the observance of this divine institution, must inevitably prove a failure and a mockery. We may have the form of religion, but neither the power or the blessed fruits thereof.

But alas! who shall live when God doest this? I fear we are almost too far gone in worldliness and irreligion, to hope for a recovery. Many a cherished object of pursuit in the present day must be abandoned, as a delusion wherewith Satan is only alluring us on to ruin, before we shall return to the right ways of the Lord.

CONTRIBUTOR.

For the Churchman.

Dear Mr. Editor.—I read with much pleasure the excellent communication of "X. Y. Z.," in your paper, two weeks since, and the thorough exposure of a certain poetaster. It shows us that persons who have no definite theological opinions ought to be very careful what they put in print. They may sometimes make a fine flourish, and cause rhymes to jingle very musically, and yet mean nothing by it; but their readers will naturally attach some meaning to the words, and be exceedingly surprised when, two or three years afterwards, they find them teaching something quite different.

We know how sharp-sighted the nominal editor now is, in detecting any latent kindness for the Oxford Tracts, and dragging it forth to light and reproof. Any such attachment is wholly inconsistent with the character of a true Churchman and Protestant. Some six years since, however, he was not so vigilant. He was employed to write a memoir and edit the journal and papers of the Rev. Dr. Bayard, and I must say I am surprised at some of the things I there find. The introduction, for example, is dated, *Festival of St. Andrew*, 1841, and this looks very Puseyiteish. Would he date his editorials now in the same fashion? But I pass on to p. 69, where we are told, by the editor, that Dr. Bayard met a kindred spirit in Bishop Luscombe; and thence to p. 70, where the good Doctor says, "I am glad to call myself a Catholic, though in a sense as distinct as you please from that in which the Romanist endeavors to wrest it to his own purpose. I have seen enough already to make me *thank and venerate* the *Oxford divines* for the stand which they have taken, and in Bishop Luscombe, I assure you, they have a hearty *co-worker*."

Now, Mr. Editor, is not this very shocking? and yet you look in vain, sir, for any mark of disapprobation from the editorial sage. Dr. Bayard is stated by him to be a good Churchman, a true son of the Church, and receives other commendations at his hands, and yet we find he applauded the Oxford divines! So again, on the 71st page, speaking of Bishop Luscombe's Church, the *editor* says, "Here was the home of his spirit—here was the altar of the Lord, and the gate of Heaven." To those who remember how he lauded the charge of Bishop McIlvaine, proving (?) there is no altar in the Christian Church, and consider his recent assertion that he is unchangeable in his doctrinal opinions, this passage will appear very ~~complimentary~~ thereof.

Confirmatory

M. N.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—Some time ago I was informed that the Diocese of Illinois, at its last annual Convention, elected an Assistant Bishop. To-day, I see by the Journal of that Convention, that this took place on the request of the Bishop. At the same time, I am made to know that the person elected was the Bishop's nominee. I do not mean to be understood as saying that the Rev. James B. Britton was Bishop Chase's *first* choice. The Rev. Clement M. Butler had that distinction; Mr. Britton was second, was named when the Bishop found that the former would not go down. The request of Bishop Chase was that "the Convention proceed to the election of an Assistant Bishop, by reason of his age and bodily infirmities." Now Canon VI. of 1832, "*Of Assistant Bishops*," provides as follows, to wit, "Where the Bishop of a Diocese is unable, by reason of old age, or other permanent cause of infirmity, to discharge his Episcopal duties, an Assistant Bishop may be elected by and for the said Diocese." The ground on which the election of an Assistant Bishop for Illinois was asked was therefore, *in terms*, canonical, though not *the* ground on which the Canon permits an election, or on which the Church may consent to the consecration of the person elected. "When the Bishop of a Diocese is *unable*, by reason," &c., says the Canon.

In this case, the Bishop of the Diocese neither declared himself "*unable*, by reason of old age, to discharge his Episcopal duties," nor does it appear that the Convention so judged respecting him. The "age and bodily infirmities" of Bp. Chase were the grounds of the action of the Diocese of Illinois, *and not the Bishop's inability to discharge his Episcopal duties* in consequence of them.

This, it is believed, would not be pleaded under the circumstances. There would be so little consistency in the plea, if it were advanced, that it would be at once overthrown. Let a person stand on Jubilee hill, and behold from thence the extensive operations going on just before it; let him survey the crops growing, estimate the crops harvested, and the number of acres prepared for crops to be sown; let him note the beautiful herd of cattle, such as might be envied by a New England farmer, and the large flock of blooded sheep feeding in those pastures; let him survey "Jubilee College Mills," for flouring and making lumber; the buildings erected and in progress; the prosperous store, "its goods all paid for;" the College, of which Bishop Chase is President, with its 35 boys; the printing establishment, "so necessary to the success of a literary institution," the post-office, so useful to a Bishop; and know the commercial and mechanical interests connected with that point,—"all, all" in Bishop Chase's name, and under his supervision and control, and the result could not fail to be the conviction, that the ability to attend to such secular concerns, would, if these were put aside, or devolved upon a lay assistant, be quite sufficient "to discharge" the necessary "Episcopal duties" in the Diocese of Illinois, with its 22 clergymen, and small number of churches. No such plea as inability in the Bishop is, therefore, advanced. It is "age and bodily infirmities." Should this avail to secure the consecration as it has secured the election of an assistant? Our vote would, in any case, be No; under the circumstances it would be, if we might cast it, a double No.

M. C. R.

Aug. 25, 1847.

For the Churchman.

"L' Institut d' Afrique," is a Society established in Paris in the year 1838. The present President is Le Duc de Montmorency. It publishes a monthly journal, which gives to its readers whatever may be interesting with respect to the African race in every quarter of the world. In a late number, it notices the refusal of the Episcopal Convention of New-York to admit to its charge a Church composed of colored people. It simply states the fact, with the ayes and noes of the vote, and then quotes, from Job, "I have said to corruption, thou art my father; to the worm, thou art my mother and my sister."

A.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—Such contributions as that of "North," in your paper of August 14th, cannot but command the serious attention of every right-minded man. Founded on the eternal principles of truth and justice, and conceived in the general spirit of the Gospel, it must produce a favorable impression on the intelligent Christian. I beg to add to the question which he has so well answered, a few others, for such consideration as you, Mr. Editor, or "North," or any of your correspondents, (aids, than whom few Editors have more intelligent ones,) may be pleased to bestow upon them.

Can any clergyman be, by discipline, except according to our own written law, so stopped in the discharge of his ministerial functions, as to be debarred from being "restored to the ministry?"

Is there any authority for permanent privation of ministerial functions, except in the thirty-ninth canon of the General Convention of 1832?

Can such privation be inflicted on any except a "degraded minister?"

Is not suspension a distinct punishment from degradation?

Can suspension be lawfully changed by any Court into degradation by being rendered indefinite?

Would not the attempt to do so, nullify the whole act?

Is the present position of the Bishop of New York, called by some indefinite suspension, authorized by any canon?

Was the act which occasioned it a lawful one? Is it binding?

Does not the Bishop's entire submission to it, independently of the inherent right of every freeman, give him a just claim to an authoritative declaration, at the earliest opportunity, of his freedom from lawful let or hindrance in his official functions and rights?

Such questions need cause no excitement or ill nature. They relate to simple principles of law and order; and principles of liberty which Americans and Protestants know how to prize. They present points to which no true American and Protestant can be indifferent; and involve issues which every just and intelligent man will admit, possess from their grave importance, and their intimate relation to personal and official rights, and to the wholesome supremacy of law and order, merits of their own, which should be regarded in entire severance from all collateral considerations, not necessarily involved in them as abstract questions. An answer to them, founded on an intelligent view of the principles and provisions of our canon law, and characterized by the excellent spirit and good sense, and the love of truth and justice, which "North" has shown, would be a valuable contribution to the cause of righteousness in the various departments of our ecclesiastical administration.

N. J.

For the Churchman.

I heartily thank you, Mr. Editor, for the able and convincing review, thus far, of the trial of our suffering and patient friend, Bishop Onderdonk. But I scarcely know in what terms to express the surprise and gratification I experienced in reading, in the last week's Churchman, the affidavit of Mr. Peck, "Our Driver." I am of the number—and they are not few—of those, who, from the beginning, have viewed the kind-hearted Bishop of New York as a persecuted and misused man. I have looked with, perhaps, too little charity upon the professed *good intentions* of the originators of this trial, and, I must say, no inconsiderable degree of suspicion upon most of the witnesses in the case.

Little things, Mr. Editor, will sometimes fill a large space in one's memory. At the interesting ceremony of the consecration of the present estimable Bishop of Western New York, Bishop Onderdonk delivered his Valedictory to the newly formed Diocese. It was a solemn and touching scene to all present; and to appearance, none was more deeply affected than our cool and calculating friend, who, from his own subsequent solemn oath, had then for about two years been under the impression that this man had offered his wife repeated and gross insults! Yes, this same Reverend Clement M. Butler, as I am credibly informed, was present on the above occasion, and freely shed his tears on parting with his Bishop. Can Mr. B. deny this? Can he explain the cause of *those tears?* If he can, it will doubtless be gratifying to yourself, Mr. Editor, your readers, perhaps "the Court," but to none more than to

August 3, 1847.

CURIOSITY.

THE CHURCHMAN.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPT. 4, 1847.

FLOYD SMITH, General Agent, No. 12 John-st up stairs

Thus far every step of this investigation has strengthened the conviction that Bishop Onderdonk is an innocent and most cruelly persecuted man. Mr., or, as we now say, *Doctor* Butler's accusations have been thrown to the winds. Dr. Hawks's accusations had before fallen to the ground by the almost unanimous admission of the Court. The accusations of the secret informers which have furnished the material for the fourth and ninth articles of the Presentment, have served only to proclaim in louder tones than the rest the "disappointed expectation"* and blighted hopes* of the Presenters. The fifth and sixth Articles appear as the broken columns of a ruined fabric, which will perpetuate the memory of that remarkable man, the Rev. James C. Richmond, who, in the accomplishment of an object to which his destiny impelled him, and from which nothing short of omnipotence could have turned him, has enlisted the services of men of higher station than himself; tolerating *their* schemes of personal and party vengeance, as an accident necessary to the attainment of *his* ends. The seventh Article has also been swept away, and the verdict respecting it has been shown to be distinguished from the rest only by the clearer proof which it furnishes of want of care, or something worse, on the part of the Presenters.

There remains only the eighth Article of the Presentment, which is as follows—

ARTICLE VIII.—And the said Presenting Bishops do further present and allege, that in the afternoon of the said seventeenth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-two, the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk held a Confirmation at Whitestone Chapel, on Long Island aforesaid, and after the service went to spend the evening at the residence of Joseph L. Franklin, Esq., on said island; that about nine o'clock at night, the Bishop was returning home to the house of the said Henry M. Beare, where he was a guest, and was accompanied in the carriage of the said Henry M. Beare by the said Charlotte Beare, the wife of the said Henry M. Beare, she being constrained by circumstances to ride with the said Bishop against her own desire, and she and the said Bishop sitting alone on the back seat; that while thus on their way the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk again insulted the said Charlotte Beare in the grossest manner, by impurely and unchastely putting one arm around her body, while he thrust his other hand beneath her dress, upon her naked bosom; that upon the same being repelled, the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk repeated the indignity, and finished his acts of rudeness by passing his hand in the most indecent manner down the body of the said Charlotte Beare, outside of her dress, so that nothing but the end of her corset-bone prevented his hand from being pressed upon the private parts of her body; all which acts and doings threw the said Charlotte into the deepest distress;—to the manifest scandal and injury of the Church of which the said Benjamin T. Onderdonk was a Bishop, and in violation of his vows before God, solemnly entered into on his consecration.

Now there is one fact, not mentioned in the Article, which throws utter discredit upon the allegations contained in it, and that is that Mr. Beare himself, who, as well as his nephew, was in the carriage at the time, heard nothing of all these pretended insults *until after he reached home*, when he was *privately* informed of them by his wife. That a *virtuous* woman, with her husband sitting before her, should suffer a man *to draw her forcibly towards him, to thrust his hand into her naked bosom, and to* offer her the other *brutal insults* above mentioned, is a statement wholly incredible. The *extreme improbability* of the statement is sufficient reason to demand several unimpeachable witnesses, together with the evidence of *concurring circumstances*, to render it *credible*. The instant alarm of the lady, the instant resentment of the husband, the instant and ever after uniform displeasure of both towards the monster who could be capable of so brutal an outrage, which, if the story were true, would be its concurring circumstances, are all wanting; and in their place we have the silence of the lady until her return home, a mysterious hint of the matter to her husband after their return home, a cool proposition of his to have family prayers before he should hear the particulars, and a gratuitous request to the Bishop to lead the devotions! The person who can believe this story on the testimony of only one witness, and she one who distinctly said of a written memorandum which she had made of it, "*It is destroyed;*" who *repeated* this distinct assertion with a *particularity* of time; saying, I destroyed it "*some time last week;*" and who then flatly contradicted herself by the equally distinct assertion, "*I have not destroyed it;*" the person, we say, who can believe this story on such testimony ought, in all reason, to be content to enjoy his belief by himself, and not seek to impose it, by a solemn decree, on all others.

Mrs. Beare, it must be owned, testifies to the truth of this story; but does any one believe if the seventh article of the Presentment had been the only one in which Mrs. Beare was personally concerned, that she, in the full and distinct view of that part of her husband's affidavit on which the seventh article was founded, would have testified to no more, than in fact she did testify to in regard to it? We suppose not. But Mrs. Beare's mind, at the time of the Trial, was absorbed in the eighth Article of the Presentment, or the matters contained in it; she felt that her testimony on this Article would be decisive of the question at issue and of all the interests involved in it. This was uppermost in her thoughts, and the consequence was that the matters laid in the seventh Article fell to their natural level, and she had no temptation to exaggerate them. *She was off her guard, and the truth came out.* She forgot the Presenters, forgot her husband, forgot herself, and forgot the cause; and speaking out, in the native simplicity of her heart, without bias or excitement, without artifice or guile, related the occurrences of the morning's drive, in a plain, unaffected, straightforward manner; as unlike to her husband's affidavit as is truth to fiction.

Now the lady who could make to her husband the statement in Mr. Beare's affidavit; who could go to him *in a state of agitation, take him to her room*, and there tell him that the Bishop *had taken liberties with her which she did not like*, that he had put his arm around her, and *drawn her close to him, while* with his hand he *felt* her bosom; that she had removed his hand and *endeavored*, and *succeeded* in the endeavor, *to draw herself away from him as far as the seat would allow;* who could declare to her husband, and persist in the declaration, that the Bishop's *motives were impure;* in short, that he had treated her with gross indignity and wanton insult; and afterwards say, "The Bishop put his arm around me in an unbecoming manner, which caused me to draw from him," and add, "*There is nothing more to state of that ride;*" the lady, we say, who is capable of doing this once, is capable also of going a second time to her husband in a state of increased agitation, and telling him, a second time, in the privacy of her chamber, a story which bears no more proportion to fact and reality than the first. We do not at all doubt that Mrs. Beare has done what she has thus proved herself capable of doing; and that the second story which, in a state of agitation, she related to her husband of the occurrences of the evening will appear to her own mind at the hour of death, or at the day of judgment, in a light similar to that in which the first story, respecting the occurrences of the morning ride, appeared to her, in an unguarded and unsuspecting moment, on the Trial, and be found to bear about the same proportion to fact and reality.

The main reasons which have brought us to this conclusion have been so clearly and strongly stated by Bishop Whittingham that we deem it unnecessary to do more, at present, than to quote that part of his Opinion which bears on the present point. For power of discrimination, for insight into human character, for intuitive perception of truth in testimony, without the parade, and *seemingly* without the assistance of those rules of evidence which experience has collected for the guidance of judicial inquiries, for force of reasoning, and for that concentration of thought and language which exhausts without expanding its subject, we regard this Opinion as unrivalled. *We* attach the more importance to it, because we know the man; we know him to be possessed of that indomitable energy and untiring industry which, in an investigation of this sort, would suffer nothing to escape him, and of that inflexible honesty, of that stern, ascetic, and, as we have sometimes wrongfully thought, *fanatical* jealousy of the honor and purity of the Church, that no power under heaven could blind him to the evidences of guilt and induce him to screen an offender, or restrain him from bringing the proofs of guilt, when detected, to light, and exposing the offender to punishment. "Were Bishop Onderdonk my own brother," he said to us in the privacy of our study, while he was a professor in the General Seminary, in reference to a scandalous report which sprung up soon after the Utica Convention, of the falsity of which he was afterwards thoroughly satisfied, "were he my own brother, I would be the first to present him!" The course he took in regard to Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, though in our judgment entirely wrong, is another among the hundred proofs that might be given of the honesty of his Opinion in the present case, and its freedom from party bias; and as to its arguments, they certainly never have been, and, in our opinion at least, they never will be refuted. That the majority of the Court should have "improperly hindered him,"* as he says, from reading his Opinion "at the time prescribed by the Canon," i. e. *before* the verdict of the Court was given, and only consented to hear it *after* the verdict was pronounced, is enough, in our judgment, not only to shake confidence in the soundness of the majority's verdict, but also to excite (though not to justify) a painful suspicion of its honesty. In addition to the grounds and reasons of the Minority's Opinion as set forth by themselves, and especially by Bishop Whittingham, we refer also to the communication of a correspondent in another column, who, with no conceivable motive but the love of truth and justice, has reviewed the Trial by the lights and with the advantages of long judicial experience, and has given such reasons for refusing credence to Mrs. Beare's case in particular, as must have very great weight with all unprejudiced and considerate minds. Nothing but the deepest and clearest conviction that a great wrong had been done could have induced a man, imbued with a fervent devotion and love of the Church, and formed by all the habits of his life to reverence the decisions of judicial tribunals, thus to plant himself, as far as the private expression of opinion goes, in diametrical opposition to the verdict of this Episcopal Court. If these investigations (we mean those of the Minority of the Court and of this writer) do not fix by implication a character on the Majority's decision which is better implied than expressed, they at least remove from under it that *moral certainty* which is necessary, in a Christian and civilized community, to uphold a verdict of *Guilty*. This exhaustion of the subject by others makes it a work of supererogation in us to offer a formal analysis of the eighth Article and of the testimony brought to support it, and we have therefore prescribed to ourselves a different train of remark from that which, under other circumstances, we should have felt bound to pursue. Annexing the portion of Bishop Whittingham's Opinion above alluded to, and commending it to the careful perusal of our readers, we shall revert ourselves to the point which we left at the end of the last paragraph.

Before we give the extract, however, we beg to say that there is one consideration, not adverted to, so far as we remember, in the Minority's Opinions, nor by others who have taken the same side of the question, which weakens the credibility of the testimony in this case. 'Is the subject,' says Gambier in his excellent treatise on Moral Evidence, 'of such a nature, and so circumstanced as to admit of an easy confutation if false? This consideration, also, is of great importance; for otherwise the law of reputation, the great principle of human conduct, opposes no barrier against falsehood; but the witness is at liberty to make what misrepresentations he pleases, and thereby to gratify any secret passion, or to promote any private interest, without danger of disgrace.' Mrs. Beare tells a story which, if false, is of all others the most difficult of confutation. Its want of concurring circumstances, and her own subsequent deportment, so inconsistent with its truth, and the general want of frankness, so conspicuous in her testimony, combined with the inherent improbability of the story, discredit it, and restrain us from believing it. But its direct falsity, if false, can be certainly known only to herself and the Bishop; and therefore the full and unequivocal proof of its falsity, if the Bishop's denial of her allegations be not taken, rests in her own bosom alone. In a case of criminal connection this could not be; the places and times in which and the circumstances under which the parties are seen together, their mutual deportment, their conversation, or written correspondence, all enter into the proof. But in the present case there can be nothing of this sort. Is it right, then, to condemn any man on allegations, the witness to which, if false, may so easily escape detection? Has it been kind, nay rather, has it not been most cruel, to this witness to bring her, or to cause her to be brought, or to allow her to be brought, into so perilous a position? a position which without the possibility of good, exposes the veracity of a witness to the severest trial, and excites against her inevitable suspicion. We know not where the fault lies, whether in the Presenters, the Court, or the Canon under which they acted; but most firmly are we convinced of, and most deeply do we feel the *cruelty* of making a woman publicly responsible for a statement which is not volunteered by her or her rightful guardians, for the redress of her own wrongs or the vindication of her own honor, but solicited from her by others for the accomplishment of other ends; which from its very nature and from the circumstances under which it is given, *proves* nothing; but merely furnishes food for suspicion and scandal, heart-burnings and dissensions; and which relies for its effect mainly on the sympathies extended to the sex and the defenceless position of the witness, and on covering with odium those who feel it a duty to question the testimony on which it rests.

We now give the passage from Bishop Whittingham—

The seventh and eighth articles, distinct allegations, but parts of the same story, have the peculiarity of a show of support for the testimony of the single witness on whom, in that, like all others, they depend. If the allegations, as they now stand in the Presentment, were ever made to the respondent, and admitted by him, they would, by that confession, be sufficiently proved. It has been contended that they were so made, and admitted, and to that effect, the testimony of Drs. Milnor and Muhlenberg has been adduced. On the other hand, the united testimony of all present, that at the interview when they were first made known to the Respondent, he denied them; the admitted uncertainty whether that denial had reference to the criminal character given to what passed between him and Mrs. Beare, or to the attempted statement of what did pass; the discrepant testimony of Drs. Milnor and Muhlenberg, as to the way in which that statement was made; the clear, distinct, and full evidence of Dr. Higbee, as to his impression of the denial made at the first interview, and the kind of admission made at the second: and the evident treacherousness of Dr. Milnor's memory, which has betrayed him into contradictory statements relative to a matter of no less importance than his own faithfulness to the agreement or understanding, after those interviews, to make no further mention of the transaction; afford abundant ground to doubt the correctness of Dr. Milnor's uncorroborated recollections, and to acquiesce in the impression of Dr. Higbee, which alone is reconcilable with what all admit to have taken place between Dr. Milnor and the Bishop, at the close of the second interview, and with the honesty and piety of character of all four clergymen concerned;—to wit, that the Bishop did not admit the allegations as implying guilt, but sought to reconcile a difference, which he, in the most charitable view of the conduct of his accuser, attributed to mistake and misconstruction. The charge of impurity and immorality in the case of Mrs Beare, then, and the specifications on which that charge is grounded, still rest on the single testimony of Mrs. Beare. When presented to the Respondent by his brethren of the clergy, he denied them with indignation; and there is not the slightest evidence to fix what extent he meant to give to his subsequent declaration that he would not impeach the veracity of Mrs. Beare.

---

* That this language does no injustice to the Presenters is evident from the following passages from Bishop Meade's "Statement."

"Besides the cases on which affidavits were given, we heard while in Philadelphia and New York, of numerous other instances of similar misconduct imputed to the Bishop, and measures were in operation for ascertaining their truth, and the practicability of obtaining evidence of the same for the trial; on which account it was proper to keep the presentment open. There was reason to believe that in several most important ones, witnesses might be induced to furnish affidavits. This expectation, however, was disappointed." *Statement*, p. 17.

"There were some cases which we still hoped might be witnessed to, when the Court should meet, but whose particulars as to time, place and circumstance, we had not been able to ascertain through the unwillingness of the persons concerned. There were others, which we hoped the authority of the Court might enable us to obtain."—*Ib.* p. 18.

* While these remarks were passing through the press, we received a brief communication which we here subjoin. It will be observed that others of the minority of the Court introduced their opinions with remarks similar to that above quoted from Bishop Whittingham. Thus Bishop Ives says, "The following opinion, the reading of which was, in my view, most unjustly arrested and forbidden in the proper place, is introduced here;" Bishop Doane, "Prepared and intended but not permitted to be read, *before* the decision of the question, 'guilty or 'not guilty;'" and Bishop Kemper, "Had I been permitted yesterday to give my real opinion," &c. The fact of our inserting the following implies our belief of its truth; and we shall be glad to learn that we are mistaken:

To the Editor of the Churchman.

Sir,—A very extraordinary circumstance in reference to the trial of the Bishop of New York has recently been related to me, which, if true, speaks volumes as to the "temper of the majority of the Court." The strangeness, however of the asserted fact, so challenges belief, that I cannot but think it false. I write for information.

The story, said to be derived from *high authority*, is substantially as follows:

After the prevention, by the Senior Bishop, of the reading of the written opinion of the Bishop of North Carolina, the Bishop of New Jersey conceiving it his inalienable right to declare the reasons of his opinion, persisted, notwithstanding the negative of Bishop Chase, in reading the same. Upon which, the majority of the Court proceeded by *shuffling of feet*, and other demonstrations of a similar nature to manifest their determination not to listen to the document.

As Bishop Doane raised his voice, so increased the noise of his brethren, until at length fairly overpowered, he was obliged to desist.

Comment, Mr. Editor, is unnecessary, the truth or falsehood of the allegation needs only be known. B.

What he would not do, Mrs. Beare herself has compelled this Court to do, by her unfortunate statements concerning a written document in which she had set down the particulars of her story. The witness who could positively declare of such a document, "it is destroyed," and then, within five minutes, be brought, by the searching interrogatories of Counsel, to admit, in so many words, "It is *not* destroyed," cannot claim credit for veracity. Neither does Mrs. Beare's very remarkable want of memory concerning transactions which one would suppose she, of all others, would be least likely to forget in any of their minutest circumstances—transactions subsequently to her alleged insult, with him by whom she complains of having been insulted—wear the appearance of veracity. It is as hard to believe that she and her husband could have so entirely forgotten all that sufficient witnesses have proved to have passed between them and the Bishop, subsequently to the transactions now made ground of accusation against him, as it is to conceive how such things could have passed between them and him, had they at the time believed him to be guilty of the immorality and impurity now laid to his charge.

Whether the manner of the Bishop in the morning's ride with Mrs. Beare, which has been made the subject of the seventh article of the Presentment, was not too free and caressing for the lively sensibility of that lady; whether it was not accounted for, and justified by the more than ordinary intimacy, and paternal intercourse of the Bishop with her husband from his boyhood, and the consequent filial relation of the wife to the husband's old friend and second father;—these are questions not for this Court to solve. Our business is with the extent and intentions of the freedoms taken. Were they immoral in their nature? Were they impure in their design? Mrs. Beare's own account of them does not prove that either she or her husband so regarded them, when she first made her complaint to him. She thought them "unbecoming," "too familiar;" she did not like them: and he sympathized with his newly-married wife, as was natural. But did they think the acts criminal? They do not say so. They cannot; for if they did, the conduct of both, for the remainder of the day and evening, would be set in an extraordinary light; and the husband, who, knowing and believing his wife to have been grossly insulted in the day-time, had placed her again that night in the situation that had exposed her to the insult, would deserve a name harsher than I care to introduce. Mr. Beare did not believe the story now before the Court, when he took his wife home from Mr. Franklin's in the evening ride, which is made the subject of the eighth specification. There is no evidence that he ever believed it, except so far as to be sure that it had foundation, to be confident in his wife's veracity, to acquit her of intentional false witness. Now it is observable that Mrs. Beare, like Mrs. Butler, was newly-married when these occurrences took place. A new station in life had brought with it new notions of propriety, of dignity, of decency. What, as in Mrs. Butler's case, the girl might have suffered without a thought of impropriety, the bride regarded in a different light; the caresses of a parent were no longer uppermost in her mind, and what, under other circumstances, might have been taken as they were meant, for tokens of paternal fondness, became disgusting under another construction, lent them by the prevailing current of her affections. That Mrs. Beare, having once misconstrued the attention of the Bishop, is capable of so framing her narrative of what then and subsequently transpired, as to make it bear her out in her misconstructions, the whole tenor of her testimony too plainly shows. Ingenuousness, frankness, and candor, are not the characteristics of that testimony. It was painful to listen to the efforts of Counsel to obtain from this witness direct and positive answers on topics which it was her interest to avoid. There is too much in the testimony of Mrs. Beare that looks like convenient forgetfulness, evasion, and coloring by partial and imperfect statements, to leave a doubt that when she had once committed herself to her husband as to the character of the Bishop's familiarities, she was capable of viewing and representing every thing that might subsequently occur, in the aspect most favorable to her declared anticipations. Into the details of her representation of the occurrences in the second ride, I do not care to go, for obvious reasons. Setting aside moral improbabilities, there are circumstantial difficulties in her statement that will not bear examination; and that statement has the additional disadvantage of being set forth quite differently in her own evidence, in the affidavit of her husband, and in the recollections of Dr. Muhlenberg—no two agreeing in the minute details which alone give explicitness and atrocity to the alleged offence. I cannot receive such facts, from such a witness, under the witness's own coloring. Whatever may have taken place between the Bishop and Mrs. Beare on that occasion, I find no adequate support for the charge of designed indecency on his part, improbable as the person, the time, and the circumstances make it. There must be more and better evidence, before I can convict the Respondent of the immorality and impurity alleged in the seventh and eighth specifications of the Presentment. To my mind he appears now, what I believe him to have appeared to the four clergymen who first brought the allegations to his notice, *not guilty* of such immorality and impurity.

On the strength of these, among other reasons, we believe that Mrs. Beare did, in regard to the evening's ride, the same thing which the difference between her own testimony on the Trial and her husband's affidavit *proves* her to have done in regard to the morning's ride. If the question is asked why Mrs. Beare should do this, what motive or inducement she could have thus to brood upon an innocent occurence, and exaggerate it into a source of agitation and distress, the answer is that *we* are concerned only with the *fact*. Mr. Beare's affidavit is *proof* of what his wife told him respecting the occurrences of the morning's ride, and Mrs. Beare's testimony on the trial, on a matter in which she had no motive to warp or suppress the truth, and under the examination of an acute and unsparing Counsel, who was determined to draw out of her every thing that she could tell, is *proof* of what actually happened during the morning's ride between herself and the Bishop; and consequently the comparison of the husband's affidavit and the wife's testimony is *proof* that this witness did once exaggerate an innocent occurrence into a source of agitation and mystery. This is the *fact;* the solution of the fact is another matter, and is, perhaps, a problem more proper to the physician of the body than the physician of the soul. And we take this occasion to avow in public, the wish which during the trial we expressed in private, that the opinion of eminent physicians, on the value of female constructions, or of female testimony even, under certain phases of mind and body, might have been given in evidence before the Court. The avowal will probably expose us to the same odium which the Respondent himself would have been subjected to, had he acted on this suggestion. Be it so; we shall cheerfully consent to any amount of odium which may be consequent on an honest attempt *to get at* THE TRUTH on a question of INNOCENCE or GUILT to a Bishop in the Church of GOD. We have no hesitation in saying that we regard Mrs. Beare's case as more fit for medical than judicial investigation.

Indeed, it does seem to us that they who put this question must be either strangely ignorant or more strangely forgetful of human infirmity. However, to keep nothing of this case back, and to explore it to the bottom, we shall quote that part of Mr. Beare's affidavit, on which this eighth specification is founded; in which we shall find, if we mistake not, such an account of this extraordinary and anomalous affair as serves to explain its origin and process consistently with Mrs. Beare's *intentional* adherence to truth. The passage is this—

> In the afternoon the Bishop went to hold a Confirmation in the other Church under my charge, viz., at Whitestone Chapel, my wife, privately to me, declining to ride in the same carriage with him. My wife, accordingly, rode to the chapel with my brother, Thomas M. Beare, in his carriage or buggy, while the Bishop rode in my barouche-wagon, with my nephew and myself.
>
> The services being ended, we all returned in the same vehicle in which we had gone, until we came to the gate and lane leading from the main road to the residence of Joseph Franklin, Esq. We had engaged to take tea with Mr. Franklin's family, and at the gate my brother Thomas (not intending to be one of the party at Mr. Franklin's) left us and drove onward to my house, my wife coming into the carriage where I was, in order to ride up the lane, to Mr. Franklin's house. About six or half-past six in the evening, we reached Mr. Franklin's residence, where we spent the evening; and about nine at night, we, that is, the Bishop, my wife, I, and my young nephew, before mentioned, started in my barouche-wagon for home. The Bishop and my wife occupied the back seat, and my nephew were in front; I drove; and, up to a short period after my arrival at home, I still thought that my wife had been mistaken as to the Bishop's conduct of the morning, and I had not the least suspicion of him. Immediately after we reached home, my wife again spoke to me, in private, and told me that the Bishop had repeated his indecencies; I told her we would have family prayers immediately, when we could retire, and she could then inform me of particulars. When we were in our chamber alone, my wife told me that the Bishop had, as in the morning, put his arm around her, drawn her forcibly to him, and thrust his hand within her dress, so that it was on her naked bosom, that she indignantly threw it from her, that he repeated it, when she again threw it off angrily, and nothing prevented her from screaming out, instantly, but the fact that my little nephew was by my side, and that, through his agency, the matter would then be made public, and she dragged into a notoriety painfully distressing to a virtuous and respectable female; besides this, she recollected that the distance from her home was short, and that she would therefore soon be delivered from his presence. After she had thus indignantly thrown his hand off several times, in the manner above stated, the Bishop, she informed me, in a most indecent manner passed his hand down her body, and the bone of her corset alone protected her from the gross indignity of having his hand pressed upon the private parts of her body.
>
> She spent the night in a state of mind bordering on madness, and my agony was but little short of hers. The next day (Monday) the Bishop was to be at Dr. Muhlenberg's school, at College Point, seven or eight miles distant. Immediately after breakfast he was to take his departure, and approached my wife to take leave—seemingly offering to kiss her. She drew back. As the wagon left the house he turned, and kissed his hand to her once or twice. I had no servant-man to send with him to Dr. Muhlenberg's; I did not like to trust my nephew a distance so far, and besides, I wished very much to see some of my brethren as soon as I could, for consultation, and I knew I should meet them at College Point; I therefore resolved to take him there myself. On our ride very little was said between us, and my manner was so cold and reserved, that I suppose he must have remarked it. When we arrived at the Point, I sought for the Rev. Mr. Kerfoot, (now of Maryland,) and told him my story, asking his advice. He proposed to me that we should ask God's direction, and we knelt down together, he making a short prayer asking for guidance. He then said he would confer with Dr. Muhlenberg, and I immediately returned home. It was a few days after this that I received a note from Dr. Muhlenberg, desiring to see me at College Point, where I immediately went; and in reply to Dr. Muhlenberg's inquiries, I told him the story as already set forth in this paper; and as I proceeded, the Doctor took notes of it in writing, so framed as to be unintelligible to any one, should they be lost; and the Doctor said he would see the Bishop on the subject.

We accept Mr. Beare's affidavit as proof that *his wife told him* the above story. We believe that after their return home from the fatigue and excitement of the day, Mrs. Beare again took her husband aside and told him the same story to which he had turned an incredulous ear in the morning; that he said, We will have family prayers, and retire and talk over the matter in private; that they did retire and spent the night in a state of considerable excitement; that the next morning, after prayers and breakfast together, Mrs. Beare and the Bishop parted; that Mr. Beare drove the Bishop to College Point, and there communicated his wife's story and excitement to a young clergyman of earnest piety, who had spent most of his life in the retirement of St. Paul's College; that Mr. Kerfoot communicated the story to Dr. Muhlenberg, a clergyman of unblemished reputation, and singleness of purpose, and Principal of St. Paul's College; that Dr. Muhlenberg, after advising with Dr. Wainwright, who was at that time officially connected with the same institution, and with Dr. Milnor, the late well known rector of St. George's Church in this city, called on the Bishop in company with the Rev. Drs. Milnor and Higbee, (acting for Dr. Wainwright, who joined them soon after,) and there gave the Bishop an account of Mr. Beare's story.

It is not for us to say that Mr. Beare, in this emergency, was not advised to the wisest course; but it is at least conceivable that a friend, under the same circumstances, might have addressed Mr. Beare somewhat as follows—My good friend, had your wife been really insulted by the Bishop in the manner she says, you may rely upon it she would have made no such *mystery* of the matter, but would have let you and the bishop both know it before you reached home. Her conduct, as you have described it, has all the marks of strong hysterical excitement: the long service, confirmation, and sermon, at one of your churches in the morning; the preparation of dinner for her guests at noon; the additional service, confirmation and sermon at your other church in the afternoon; and after the religious exercises, the drive to Mr. Franklin's, ~~and the~~ excitement of tea and company till 9 o'clock in the evening, have proved too much for your wife's nerves. A young married woman, occurrences which, under other circumstances, would have given her no uneasiness, have served to determine and give shape and direction to the nervous agitation superinduced by the excitement and fatigue of the day. Call in your physician and consult him on the subject; if he thinks differently, we will then have another conference, and bring the matter to the notice of the Standing Committee. But if your physician tells you, as probably he will, that your wife has been in a state of hysterical excitement and needs rest and composure, it will be better perhaps to leave her for a few days under his care. By that time her excitement will have subsided, and she will be able to give you such a calm and collected statement of facts as may possibly quiet your apprehensions.*

On the very face of Mr. Beare's affidavit two things, we think, are apparent. The first is, that Mrs. Beare's excitement was not caused by the brutal insults alleged to have been offered her by the Bishop. It is not the *kind* of excitement which such insults would *naturally* have produced, and it did not show itself at *the time* and in *the manner* which would have been natural had such been the cause. That a woman sitting by the side of her husband, should suffer a man, after five days acquaintance, to draw her forcibly towards him, and to thrust his hand into her naked bosom, and wait until she had returned home, and had family prayers and retired to her room, and *then*, and not before, have evinced an excitement *from that cause*, is wholly unnatural. The *kind* of excitement which these alleged insults would naturally have produced, is *instant indignation* and *alarm*, *instant* appeal to her husband for protection, *instant* demand to be delivered from the presence of the wretch who could thus grossly insult her. In a word, it would have been the excitement of the *passions*, (indignation and anger,) and not of the *imagination*. We do not doubt Mrs. Beare's excitement during the night, but we cannot accept so unnatural a solution of it when another sufficient and more natural one is at hand. The main cause of the excitement we take to have been the over fatigue of the day, the same manner of the Bishop which she had thought "unbecoming" and "too familiar" in the morning, and to which she was reconciled *even in the evening* when "*she recollected* (so runs the affidavit) *that the distance from her home was short*," serving, no doubt, to impart to her excitement its particular hue and determination.

The other thing apparent on the face of Mr. Beare's affidavit, is that his wife's excitement disqualified her at the time from giving any clear and satisfactory account of the occurrences to which she herself attributed her excitement. Mrs. Beare's excitement may have been owing to fatigue and exhaustion, and yet she may very honestly have ascribed it to what she considered the "unbecoming" and "too familiar" manners of the Bishop; but if so she would naturally exaggerate the causes to which she herself attributed the excitement. She would naturally say, as in fact she did say, His manners were so offensive, that if it had not been for my nephew and for my being so near home, *I would have screamed out;* not reflecting that *if* the occurrences had really been so outrageous, she most certainly *would* have screamed out. This is exactly the language of *exaggeration*, and the excitement of Mrs. Beare was not of that sudden kind which outs at once with the truth, but of that intense and protracted kind which, working on the imagination, is most apt to *invent* and exaggerate; and the distinctive characteristic of which is to exaggerate without the *moral guilt* of exaggeration. In her then state of mind she would of course, and of necessity, exaggerate the occurrences to which she herself attributed her excitement; and it would be impossible to get at the exact truth until her excitement had subsided.

What account of the matter Mrs. Beare herself would have given, had she allowed her imagination to subside, or had her husband *frankly and at once come to an explanation with the Bishop himself*, it is now impossible to say. For the very next day Mr. Beare communicated the story to Mr. Kerfoot, and he to Dr. Muhlenberg, and Dr. Muhlenberg to Drs. Milnor and Wainwright, and they (Dr. Higbee being accidentally united with them,) communicated the matter to the Bishop, who met it with an indignant and peremptory denial. Up to this point inclusive, *there is no evidence that Mr. Beare himself believed the story* of his wife, but rather the contrary. The story of the morning he certainly disbelieved; this we infer from his requesting his wife not to let the occurrence of the morning alter her manner towards the Bishop; and the correctness of this *inference* is *proved* by what he says in his affidavit, "Up to a short period after my arrival at home [in the evening], I still thought that my wife had been mistaken as to the Bishop's conduct of the morning; and I had not the least suspicion of him." That he at first turned an incredulous ear to the like story in the evening, we also infer from circumstances more numerous and of the same kind as that which has just been shown to sustain one certain inference; the circumstances, namely, of his proposing to his wife to have family prayers before he heard the particulars of the story, and requesting the Bishop to lead the devotions; of his continued hospitality to him on the next morning, and his allowing his wife to breakfast with the Bishop and to be present at his parting salutations. And if we follow Mr. Beare to the interview in the Bishop's study a few days after, we find that, according to his own statement, p. 79, the very first words which escaped from his mouth at that interview, were, "Do you deny, sir, (speaking to the Bishop) what Mrs. Beare says you were guilty of?" And throughout the whole interview, according to Dr. Higbee's clear and explicit testimony, *the denial of his wife's veracity* was the point about which Mr. Beare was chiefly concerned. But after the matter had been formally laid before the Bishop as an accusation, and had been by him distinctly and peremptorily denied, the whole matter assumed a new aspect. Then Mrs. Beare was fairly committed for the truth of her whole story; her own and her husband's interests and reputation for good sense and veracity, would bind her to consistency, and hardly allow her hallucinations (if such they were,) to subside. She might have her occasional misgivings and compunctions, but she could not go back if she would, without making herself and her husband objects of ridicule and contempt; and therefore her adherence to her original story would be very much a matter of course and no evidence of its truth, unless, indeed, it were an adherence so tenacious, resolute, and unyielding, as to indicate that deep, determined, and unconquerable aversion, with which a real indignity or insult never fails to inspire the bosom of a virtuous woman. And we must say, after a careful perusal of this whole testimony, and especially, after the numerous and gratuitous courtesies extended to the Bishop by both Mr. and Mrs. Beare, according to the very distinct evidence of the Rev. Dr. Schroeder, Mrs. Franklin, and the Rev. Messrs. Goodwin and Sweetzer, that it needed, in our opinion, just such an event as the Presentment and Trial of the Bishop, to banish all doubt and wavering from the minds of Mr. and Mrs. Beare, and to bring their belief to that degree of tenacity and firmness which is necessary to reconcile the testimony of the one, and the deportment of both, with conscious sincerity and honesty of purpose.

We consider the truth of Mrs. Beare's story to be rendered wholly inadmissible, by the fact of its being encumbered with improbabilities too many and too flagrant to be believed on almost any testimony, and least of all, on the testimony of a witness who contradicted herself on her cross-examination, and *who perseveringly refused to acknowledge* various acts of courtesy which she is proved to have shown the Bishop, by the distinct testimony of Dr. Schroeder, the Rev. Messrs. Goodwin and Sweetzer, and Mrs. Franklin. We are therefore forced on the belief, either that her story has been wilfully fabricated, or that it has originated and grown up in her mind in the manner above delineated. The former supposition is as harsh to the witness as the supposition of the truth of her story is to the Respondent, and is not to be entertained if it can be possibly avoided. The latter alternative is the dictate of charity to the witness, and is offered with that sentiment, being entirely needless to the Bishop's defence. We believe it to be the true view, because it solves, and it is the only view which does solve, all the difficulties of this singular affair: and so believing, we cannot but hope and pray that both Mr. Beare and his wife, in an hour of trial and of searching self-examination, will see the matter in this light, and be brought to acknowledge the groundlessness of the accusations which they have made, and the depth of the injury which they have inflicted.

---

* We have read this article to an eminent medical friend, who authorizes us to say that the above explanation corresponds with *well established facts* in regard to hysteria, which often manifests itself in susceptible females by disorder of the mental emotions and faculties, and a strong propensity to excite pity or some other emotion in the minds of those with whom they are most intimate. Among other authorities our friend referred us to Dr. Copland, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and one of the most eminent physicians of the age, who, in a section headed "Hysterical disorders of the *Mental Faculties*," remarks, "Hysterical females are not merely capricious and whimsical, but they often become enthusiastic for a time in the pursuit of an object, or in cherishing an emotion by which they have been excited. In many such cases," continues Dr. Copland, "the nervous excitement determines the character of the mental disorder; elevating certain of the moral sentiments or intellectual manifestations to a state of extravagance, passing in some instances into delusion or monomania."

The mail steamer, the Cambria, which arrived at Boston last week, brought English papers to the 4th inst., containing news highly important in a political and commercial point of view. The daily papers, however, have put our readers in possession already of nearly every thing which we have to communicate.

The Bishopric of Manchester bill, after passing the House of Lords, was slightly amended in the Commons and passed. The Lords accepted the amendments July 22d, and the bill received the Royal assent in the usual form on the next day, when the three estates of the realm were assembled for the first time in the new House of Lords to end the Parliament elected in 1841.

The result of the elections, so far as we learn, is a triumph for the Liberal party. The Conservative party, which it was once Sir Robert Peel's boast to have created, is totally broken up. The Protectionists and Peelites together, will not make up much more than two-fifths of the new House of Commons, and the state of feeling is such as to preclude the idea that these two fragments can again unite. Mr. Gladstone has been returned for Oxford, and Mr. Goulburn retains his seat for Cambridge. Lord John Manners was defeated at Liverpool, the Free-trade candidates having overwhelming majorities. Lord Ashley, aided by the anti-Maynooth feeling, succeeds Mr. Roebuck at Bath. Lord George Bentinck has been returned, but we hear nothing as yet of Mr. D'Israeli.

"In reference to Oxford you will be glad to see what a noble rally is made for Mr. Gladstone. At the end of three days, the time originally fixed for the polling, he was ahead of Mr. Round, 193. I am momently expecting the Times, and may be able to add the result of yesterday's work. It seems morally impossible that he should not be returned. [Gladstone's majority on the fourth day is 180. One day's polling remains.]

You will be surprised at the strength of the vote for Lord Fielding at Cambridge, but the explanation, I think, is this. Though brought forward by the Low Church Party, as an Anti-Popery Candidate, many of the sound Churchmen in the Senate, looking simply to the good of the Church, and knowing his conscientious views as to the Church, apart from the popery question, had more confidence in him than in Mr. Golbourn, who, if left to himself, would rest very quietly among the high and dry."

In regard to Mr. Gladstone the following letter from the former Bishop of Oxford, indicates the decided position which he holds as to ecclesiastical matters—

> MY DEAR COOPER,—I beg to thank you for your letter, and to express my sincere gratification at your having brought yourself to the same conviction with regard to Gladstone that I entertain—of his soundness and deep love for our Church; and also I have to thank you for your exertions in his favor, consequent upon that conviction. I know not what more any man can require to satisfy himself than two extracts, which I can give you from notes of Mr. Gladstone's which I have by me.
>
> 1st. "My convictions," (as to the position of the Church of Rome among ourselves) "which have never varied, are so strong, that with reference to our sphere of private duty, I would invert the sentiment recently uttered by Lord Arundel in Parliament, and say, 'The Church of England will not fully have done her work until the Church of Rome has ceased to exist and to operate within these realms.'"
>
> And again, in another note, "I will never do anything having in my judgment a tendency, directly, or ever so indirectly, to 'advance the cause of Popery in these realms.' Nevertheless, if good faith or social justice shall seem to raise a claim which I cannot reject, in such case I must act justly by Jew or Turk, leaving the issue to God."
>
> Surely, my dear Cooper, no man can say more, or be required to speak more distinctly than this, unless a pledge which no man has a right to ask is demanded.
>
> Believe me, sincerely yours,
>
> (Signed) R. BATH AND WELLS.
>
> The Rev. E. P. Cooper, Burford.

We would also refer to some striking and well-timed observations of Mr. F. D. Maurice, on this Election, which will be found at p. 586 of this day's number; just published by Mr. Parker, Strand.

The last paragraph but one of the above letter refers, whether designedly or not, to a case on which Mr. Gladstone may have to express an opinion, or at all events to give a vote. Among the members returned for the City of London is a Jew, (Baron Rothschild,) and nothing less than an Act of Parliament, dispensing with the usual oaths in his case, can entitle him to sit in the House. We shall see whether those who struggled so long against Catholic Emancipation, will have any scruples about a Jew's legislating for a Christian country.

The Bishop of London has consecrated another "Bethnal Green" Church, dedicated in honor of St. Simon Zelotes. It will seat 1,500 persons: the sittings are all free.

The following extract from Lord G. Bentinck's manifesto, addressed to the electors of Lynn, Norfolk, probably sets forth the views of the Protectionists on the important questions with which it deals.

> In conclusion, I beg your permission to make some few observations on those great subjects which excite the religious feelings and the Protestant spirit of England,—I mean popular education, and the possible endowment of the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland.
>
> With respect to popular education, I have warmly in my heart, although only with my humble vote, supported the measure of Her Majesty's Government.
>
> I might say of the Roman Catholic endowment, that it is a proposition which is repudiated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and which Her Majesty's Ministers have declared they have no intention of making, and therefore I am not called upon to give my opinion on a question which is not likely to arise. But it would be altogether foreign from my habits and nature to disguise a thought which I possess that you have a right to know; and, after all that that has passed on this subject, I think you have a right to know precisely what I do feel and think about it.
>
> My ancestors come over to this country to maintain the Protestant cause, and the principles of civil and religious liberty. I should be very sorry, in these respects, to prove unworthy of them. I am ready to maintain the Protestant cause at any sacrifice, but I never could believe that it was to be maintained by violating the principles of religious freedom. I have always thought that the Protestant cause and religious liberty were identical, therefore I am one of those who for nineteen years, have consistently and earnestly advocated the removal of all disabilities from, and the fullest and most generous toleration towards, our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects.
>
> But while I hold it to be the duty of a true Christian and of a Church of England man to forbear from proscribing in any way the Roman Catholics of England or Ireland, there is not in the Queen's dominions one who would more strenuously resist than I would any attempt by Roman Catholics or others to raise a finger against the Protestant Church, either in England or in Ireland, or to interfere with in either country, still less to diminish her revenues.
>
> Taught, however, by the lessons I have learned from Burke, Pitt, and Canning—nay, I might add from the practice of King George III., of pious, Protestant, and scrupulous fame; looking to the Canadas, to the West Indies, to Gibaralter, to Malta, to the Cape of Good Hope, to Ceylon, to the Mauritus, and, above all, to our East Indian possessions, where I find all manner of endowments; remembering that before Roman Catholic emancipation was carried the obligation by the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland to receive a State provision was looked to as one of the greatest securities of the Protestant Church, I was myself at an early period of my public life of opinion, that a suitable maintenance of the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland was an arrangement which ought not to excite the religious scrules of the most deep-feeling Protestant. But I am equally of opinion, that this is an arrangement which ought never to be carried into effect without the full and general consent of the English people. This is a question on which the Protestant people of this empire must not be taken by surprise. They have already been surprised; a third experiment may produce effects which a Minister, however cunning, may not like to face. The game of 1829 must not be played over again. I will never be a party to such tricks and detestable manœuvres. It must be a question on which ample and due warning must first be given, and the sense of the kingdom asked and taken upon it before it is attempted to be carried in Parliament. Nor would I, under any circumstances, consent to the endowment, if decided on, being supplied from English funds or English pockets. The land of Ireland that has already deprived the Protestant Church in that country of one-fourth of its revenue, might well afford it if it be deemed expedient, to supply a liberal and becoming provision for the priesthood of that religion which is professed by the vast majority, the tillers of the soil.

The most interesting item of continental news is the detection of a conspiracy at Rome, the details of which, though we think them exaggerated, have been given in our daily papers.

"The Churchman" is with great ability reviewing Bishop Onderdonk's Trial. It does not fall within our province to copy or condense its arguments. We must confess, however, that they have had an effect upon our own minds—leading us to doubt the justice of the sentence passed upon the Bishop. Facts, of late, seem to have been elicited, which tend to disprove much of the testimony which caused his conviction and suspension. From a sense of justice we copy the *affidavit* recently made by Mr. Lewis L. Peck.—*Am. Mail.*

The Mail, we understand, is edited by the same gentleman who formerly edited the New World, the paper which first broke ground against Bishop Onderdonk for the ordination of Mr. Carey. The above avowal is a rare instance of magnanimity and candor.

☞ We are requested to call attention to the correction of a typographical error in the advertisement of MISS AYRES, whose school is in *Twenty-first*-street and not Twentieth-street, as the advertisement formerly read. We take pleasure in making this correction, to say that the school is one of great excellence, and styled, by a competent judge, the perfection of Church Schools.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—As the publication of the Rev. Dr. Bowman's letter, which originally appeared in your paper, seems to have given some dissatisfaction, I must request you to insert the following communication which will be sent to the Editor of the Banner of the Cross:

C.

For the Banner of the Cross.

DR. BOWMAN'S LETTER.

Mr. Editor,—In your paper of this date you remark that "it is, perhaps, proper that" it "should be known" that the Rev. Dr. B.'s letter to the Committee of the Convention of Indiana "was published without his knowledge."

I beg leave respectfully to reply that when Dr. B. addressed the Committee he said, "I have received your *official* communication;" and, "Nothing . . . remains but to thank your *Convention*, as I do most heartily, for the honor they have done me," &c. The Doctor's letter, then, was official, and intended to be a public one so far at least as the Diocese of Indiana was concerned.

When the Rev. Mr Atkinson, in 1843, declined the Episcopate of Indiana, his reasons for so doing were duly stated in a letter, and that letter as a matter of course was published with the Journal of the next Convention. At the late Convention, the chairman of the committee appointed to inform Mr. Atkinson of his election to the Episcopate in 1846 being absent, a resolution was passed that another member of the Committee be requested to inform the Convention why Mr. Atkinson again declined the office. And thereupon a written report was made by the member so requested, and entered on the minutes.

As soon as I received Dr. Bowman's letter, knowing that the members and supporters of the Church in Indiana would be anxious to hear from the Bishop-elect, and believing that some at least would, in case he declined the Episcopate, be favorable to a call for a special Convention to be held in September, I sent it to the office of the *Churchman*, and on the same day requested a friend in Brooklyn to have it forwarded and published in the *Banner*.* The question, then, of publication is a question of time; and if the Convention of the Diocese of Indiana should determine that the letter *in* question was published at an improper time, they will not fail to say so to

THE RESPONSIBLE PERSON.

August 28, 1847.

P S. The Rev. Dr. Rudd of the Utica Gospel Messenger says, that Dr. Bowman's letter "deserves an insertion in all journals."

[We are inclined to think that there must be some mistake in this matter on the part of the Banner. *We* of course were authorized to publish the letter from the fact of its being sent to us for publication by one of the committee; but independently of this we took the impression, at the time, *from the letter itself* that it was intended for publication. The impression was founded not only on the acknowledgment of "the *official* communication" of the committee, but on the fact that the letter is addressed to "the Rev. Messrs. Croes, Killikelly, and Harrison, Committee," &c.; on the sentence towards the end, "Nothing therefore remains but *to thank your Convention, as I do most heartily*, for the honor," &c., and on the sentence a little before, "My chief anxiety now is, that my motives in declining the Episcopate of Indiana, may not be misunderstood." Unless, therefore, the Banner is sure of the contrary we shall think that it is the puplication of the letter at *the present time* which has been without Dr. Bowman's knowledge, and that Mr. Croes has given a sufficient reason for anticipating the regular time of its phblication. However this may be, all will agree with Dr. Rudd that the letter "*deserves* an insertion in all journals."—ED. CH.]

---

* These two papers, it is supposed, have the widest circulation in Indiana.

Died,

At the American Hotel, in this city, yesterday morning, Mrs. MARY AKERLY, widow of the late Dr. Samuel Akerly, of Staten Island.

Mrs. Akerly left her home, accompanied by her brother, Mr. Hiram Ketchum, of New York, her daughter, and youngest son, on the 26th of July last, on an excursion for the restoration of her health, which had been delicate since the decease of her estimable husband, two years ago, and still more impaired for a few weeks past. Passing through this city she visited Lebanon, and returned to this city on the 30th July. Here she remained until the 2d August—on the 1st, in company with some members of her party, she attended St. Peter's Church, and partook of the Holy Communion. On the next day she proceeded to Sharon Springs, where, after a few days, she became more unwell, and left on the 16th to return to New York. Arriving at the American Hotel in this city, she found herself too ill to proceed, and remained with her brother, hoping that she would find herself sufficiently recruited, in a day or two, to return. The best medical advice was procured, and the best attendance brought in, but in vain. The fever continued without abatement or change, until her impaired constitution gave way, and death unsued.—[*Albany Argus, Aug.* 26.

At New Milford, Ct., August 21st, PHILIP, eldest son of Virgil D. and Sarah E. Bonesteel, aged 3 years, 9 months, and 4 days. His remains were taken to Poughkeepsie, the family residence, for interment.

Seldom if ever were parents called to resign a child more loved than this. While watching by the sick bed of this dear one, much comfort was administered to the deeply stricken parents by an article in the Churchman, accompanying an obituary notice of the fourth child in four short weeks which had been taken from one family. That article in our creed which declares our belief in "the communion of saints" was referred to, and was indeed full of consolation. "Bereaved and yet not bereaved, but still knitted to their children in the communion of saints, Christian parents should rejoice that they have laid up for themselves treasures in heaven—that they have added new inmates to the abode of the blessed, and new accessions to its joys."

God our father grant that those who have experienced like bereavements, may from these considerations derive like consolation and peace. For from God alone can any comfort come, when we feel that the light of home is dimmed, and the voice which contributed largely to its sweet music is hushed forever here. Those hands now hold a golden harp, and that voice joins in the songs of augels and anthems of praise to God and the Lamb. "God's will be done." B.

Notices.

New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society.—An adjourned meeting of the Board of Managers will be held at their Depository, No. 20 John street, on Tuesday afternoon next, the 7th instant, at 5 o'clock.

WILLIAM H. BELL, Secretary.

September 4, 1847.

Protestant Episcopal Tract Society.—An adjourned meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held at their Depository, No. 20 John street, on Tuesday afternoon next, the 7th inst., at half-past 5 o'clock, P. M.

D. HUBBEL HOYT, Sec'y.

September 4, 1847.

SERVICES FOR THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

Having been requested by the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New York, under the authority given them by the Diocesan Convention, to perform Episcopal Services in that Diocese, where they may be needed in Churches which have not been recently visited, I hereby give notice that I shall, God willing, visit the following named places in Putnam, Dutchess, and Ulster counties, at the times specified below, and that I shall be ready to perform such Episcopal services as may be desired of me.

Sunday,	September	19th, at Cold Spring,	10 1-2, A. M
"	"	" at Phillipstown,	3 P. M.
Tuesday,	"	21st, at Fishkill Landing,	10 A. M.
"	"	at Fishkill,	3 P. M.
Wednesday,	"	22d, at Wappenger's Creek,	10 A.M
"	"	" at Poughkeepsie, St. Paul's,	[3 P.M.
Thursday,	"	23d, at Pleasant Valley,	10 A. M.
"	"	at Lithgow,	3 P. M.
Friday,	"	24th, at Red Hook,	10 A. M.
"	"	at Saugerties,	3 P. M.
Sunday,	"	26th, at Brooklyn, Holy Trinity,	[10 1[illegible] A. M.

W. H. DELANCEY,
Bishop of the Diocese of Western New York.
Geneva, August 17, 1847.

Acknowledgments.

Domestic Missions.—Since his acknowledgment of the 24th August, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

From St Thomas's ch, Bethel, Ct, of whioh $3 is for Bishop Kempor's Mission, 9; St Paul's ch, Wallsboro', Pa, half, 14 50; Christ ch, Patterson, N Y, 2; St Stephen's ch, Boston, per Rev E M P Wells, 30. Total, $55 50.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
New York, August 31, 1847. 139 Broadway.

☞ *Foreign Missions.*—Since his report of August 17th, the Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following amounts:—

From Theological Seminary, Va, for Africa, 1 31; Ladies' Missionary Association, St Helena ch, Beaufort, S C, for Greece, 89 55; a friend to the Missionary, Brooklyn, monthly contribution, half, 1; offerings of Trinity ch, Edgefield, S C, 20; a friend, St Louis, Mo, for Constantinople, 5; Young iadies of Miss Haines's school, N Y, per Miss Elina Doremus, Treas, for support of a child under Bishop Boone, 25; S school, St Mark's ch, Warren, R I, for Africa, 23 30: Monthly Missionary collection, Christ ch, Norwich, Ct, half, 25; Christ ch, Springfield, Ohio, for China and Africa, 8; St Thomas's ch, Bethel, Ct, 5; do, do, for Constantinople, 5—10 12. Total, 203 28.

J. SMYTH ROGERS, Treasurer,
281 Broadway.

New-York, August 31, 1847.

Protestant Episcopal Church Missionary Society for Seamen, N. Y.—The Treasurer of this Society has the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of the following sums, since the date of his last report, 6th July:—

For the Chapel of the Holy Comforter, North River, from C A D, 5; J A F, 2; S C, 5; W C S, 5; G F S, 5—through G W Morell.

For the general purposes of the Mission:

From D H Stebbins, 5; John M Patterson, annual, 2; Michael Burke, 2; Philip Burrows, 2; Fanning C Tucker, 5; John H Brower, 5; Charles W Carmer, annual, 2; donation, 10; A G V, 25; a member of St George's ch, through F S Winston, 5; Mrs M Johnson, 2; Geo S Parker, 5; Mrs Henry Sheldon, annual 2; E L Houghton, for life membership, 20; Mark Spenoer, 10; Mrs J R Van Rensselaer, annual, 2; Misses Denning, annual, 4; Cambridge Livingston, annual, 2; John H Betts, annual, 2; Stephen R Lounsberry, annual, 2; Rev G D Cooper, 50 cts; collections in the boxes at Chapel of the Holy Comforter, 8 82; collection at the Ch of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, 18th July, after sermon by Rev Mr Parker, 78 24; Trinity ch, Fairfield, Ct, from the rector, through Rev Mr Parker, 19; St Paul's ch, Glen Cove, through the rector, Rev W A Jenks, 2; omitted in former report, H H Butterworth, 2; Wm Hinton, 2. Total, both funds, $245 16.

J. DAVENPORT, Treasurer, No. 10 Platt-st.
New York, 30th August, 1847.

Advertisements.

BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,
No 152 Washington street, Brooklyn, L. I.,
Miss HELEN M. PHELPS, Principal.

THIS Seminary will be re-opened on the 1st of September, for the reception of pupils. A limited number of young ladies will be received into the family of the Principal as boarders.

Parents from abroad are assured that every attention will be paid to the comfort and improvement of those committed to her charge. A long experience in the management of young persons, and being aided by skilful Teachers and eminent Professors, the public are appealed to with confidence for patronage.

As reference, application may be made to Mr. and Mrs. Willard of the Troy Female Seminary, with which the Principal was for several years connected as one of the Teachers. For further particulars apply to the Principal personally, or by letter.

September 4—tw$

NEW TEXT BOOKS for Schools and Colleges.—Published by D. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway.

Arnold's First Latin Book, 12mo. 50 cts.
Arnold's Second Latin Book and Practical Grammar, 12mo. 50 cts., or two vols. bound in one, 75 cts.
Arnold's Latin Prose Composition, 12mo. $1.
Arnold's First Greek Book, 62 cts.
Arnold's Greek Prose Composition, 12mo. 75 cts.
Arnold's Cornelius Nepos, with Notes, 12mo. 62 cts.
⁂ Others of Arnold's Classical Series in preparation.
Collet's Dramatic French Reader, 1mo. $1.
Adler's New German Reader, adapted to Ollendorff's Grammar, 12mo. $1.
De Fiva's Elementary French Reader, 12mo. 50 cts.
Foresti's Italian Reader, 12mo. $1.
Graham's English Synonyms, Edited by Professor Reid, 12mo. $1.
Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar, by Rodiger, edited by Prof. Conant, 8vo. best edition, $2.
Guizot's History of Civilization, with Notes by Prof. Henry, 12mo. $1.
Keightley's Mythology of Greece and Rome, 18mo. 42 cents.
Mandeville's New English Reader, 12mo. $1.
Olendorff's New German Grammar, edited by Prof. Adler, 12mo. $1 50.
Olendorff's New French Grammar, edited by J. L. Jewett, 12mo. $1.
Olendorff's New Italian Grammar, edited by Prof. Foresti, 12mo. $1 50.
The system of Mr. Olendorff is rapidly being adopted both here and in Europe.
Reid's new English Dictionary, with Derivations and numerous improvements, 12mo. 564 pages, sheep. $1.
Surenne's New Standard Pronouncing Dictionary of the French and English Languages. 12mo. contains 52,000 words. $1 50.
Taylor's Manual of Modern and Ancient History, edited by Prof. Henry, 8vo. with questions. $2 50.
Taylor's Ancient History, separate, $1 25.
Taylor's Modern History, separate, $1 50.
⁂ This work is fast superseding all other compends of History. Several colleges and large schools have adopted it.
Nearly ready, Livy, with Notes by J. L. Lincoln, Professor of Latin in Brown University. 1 vol. 12mo.
D. A. & Co. have in preparation several other valuable Educational Works. Sept. 4—1t

EDUCATION FOR BOYS.

THE WASHINGTON INSTITUTE, at Murray Hill, (Lexington Avenue and 36th street,) under the care of Messrs. PORTER, will be re-opened after the annual vacation, on the first Monday of September.

September 4—2t

STANDARD WORKS—recently published and for sale by Stanford & Swords, 139 Broadway.

The Bishop of St. Asaph's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, in one vol. royal 8vo., with copious Indexes. This important and interesting work should be in the hands of all who desire to understand the history of the Church and the political events connected with it. Price 1 50.

Bishop Brownell's Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, royal 8vo. $3. No family in the Church should be without this work.

The Complete Sermons of the Rev. Henry Melville in 2 vols. royal 8vo. 3 50.

Sermons on Public Occasions, by the same, 1 volume 8vo. $1.

A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, compiled from authentic documents, by the Rt. Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., second edition, 1 50.

Holy Living and Dying, with Prayers, &c. &c., containing the complete duty of a Christian. By the Rt. Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D., a new edition, at 50 cents, 75 cents, and $1.

A new Manual of Devotions, in three parts, containing offices of Devotion for families and private persons, edited by Bishop Ives of North Carolina, a new edition. Price 1 00.

A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church, principally taken from Nelson, edited by Bishop Hobart. Price 75 cts.

The Christian's Manual of Faith and Devotion, containing Dialogues and Prayers suited to the various exercises of the Christian life. Edited by the late Bishop Hobart. Price 63 cts.

N. B. More than one rector of a city church has caused a copy of this work to be placed in every family of his congregation.

A Treatise on the Lord's Supper, designed as a Guide and Companion to the Holy Communion, by the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, Rector of Watton. Price 75 cts.

S. & S. have received from London a great variety of interesting religious works, which they are enabled to sell at less *than half* the former prices.

September 4.

CHURCH SCHOOL FOR BOYS,
Attached to the Church of the Holy Communion.

THIS School will be re-opened on the first Monday in September. Improved arrangements have been made for giving boys a good English and elementary classical education.

Vocal music, with a view to the service of the Church, will be a daily and systematic exercise, and instruction will be afforded to those for whom it is desired, in drawing and in the French language.

Application to be made at the School, 108 West Twentieth street, or to the Pastor of the Church, next door.

September 4—3t

TO TEACHERS.

WANTED, in a private school, in a healthy and pleasant situation in Maryland, a single gentleman of experience in teaching, who is a communicant of the Church, and can bring satisfactory testimonials of his character and standing, and of his being well qualified to teach the Latin, Greek, and French languages, Mathematics, and the different branches of English. For further particulars address the Rev. John R. Keech, (P. P.) near Belle Air, Harford county, Md.

August 28—2t$

THE CHILD AND THE MOURNERS.

BY CHARLES MACKAY, LL. D.

A little child, beneath a tree,
Sat and chanted cheerily
A little song, a pleasant song,
Which was—she sang it all day long—
"When the wind blows the blossoms fall:
But a good God reigns over all."

There passed a lady by the way,
Moaning in the face of day:
There were tears upon her cheek,
Grief in her heart too great to speak;
Her husband died but yester-morn,
And left her in the world forlorn.

She stopped and listened to the child
That looked to heaven, and singing, smiled;
And saw not, for her own despair,
Another lady, young and fair,
Who also passing, stopped to hear
The infant's anthem ringing clear.

For she but a few sad days before
Had lost the little babe she bore;
And grief was heavy at her soul
As that sweet memory o'er her stole,
And showed how bright had been the Past,
The present drear and overcast.

And as they stood beneath the tree
Listening, soothed and placidly,
A youth came by, whose sunken eyes
Spake of a load of miseries;
And he, arrested like the twain,
Stopped to listen to the strain.

Death had bowed the youthful head
Of his bride beloved, his bride unwed;
Her marriage robes were fitted on,
Her fair young face with blushes shone,
When the destroyer smote her low,
And changed the lover's bliss to woe.

And these three listened to the song,
Silver toned, and sweet, and strong,
Which that child, the livelong day,
Chanted to itself in play;
"When the wind blows, the blossoms fall,
But a good God reigns over all."

The widow's lips impulsive moved;
The mother's grief, tho' unreproved,
Softened, as her trembling tongue
Repeated what the infant sung;
And the sad lover, with a start,
Conned it over to his heart.

And though the child—if child it were,
And not a seraph sitting there—
Was seen no more, the sorrowing three
Went on their way resignedly,
The song still ringing in their ears—
Was it music of the spheres?

Who shall tell? They did not know.
But in the midst of deepest woe
The strain recurred when sorrow grew,
To warn them, and console them too:
"When the wind blows, the blossoms fall,
But a good God reigns over all."

For the Churchman.

TRACTS FOR THE SEASONS.

NO. CXXXIV.

We learn from Holy Scripture that there are among God's creatures spiritual beings, good and bad, called angels; whom He is pleased to use as instruments in the accomplishment of His purposes. They were all originally pure and upright. Being, however, free agents, and of course liable to disobedience, as well as capable of obedience, some of them fell from their original innocence, and were consequently driven from their first estate of happiness. These still retain their character as spiritual beings, and a certain power as active beings; but having lost the purity in which they were created, they fell under the influence of the malignant and baleful passions which they had stirred up within themselves, and to which they gave the first vent in the unpardonable crime that produced their fall. Banished, with a great archrebel at their head, from the happiness of the celestial courts, and doomed to linger out a dreadful eternity in wretchedness and despair, they would gratify their malignant tempers by bringing men into like condemnation. As a trial of man's sincerity and firmness, and a result of his moral agency, God is pleased to suffer these fallen beings to exercise those tempers by allurements and deceptions, but never by irresistible force; and as a counterbalance, makes those angels which have retained their first estate His instruments and agents of good.

How far the devil susceeded in his first attempt on our nature, then pure and happy, must be too sensibly felt by all reflecting persons. His design in that attempt, however—the utter destruction of our species—being warded off by the infinite mercy which prompted the plan of redemption, a way of escape is open to us, whereby we may pass to an eternal removal from all his arts. The choice of that way, however, and the walking therein, must be each one's own work. By the grace of God, through the Redeemer, which is procured for all, and freely offered to all, every one may find that blessed way, and walk therein. But during the probation in which they are required thus to walk, evil spirits are allowed to try them, and thereby made instruments of testing their sincerity and faithfulness.

Thus far we have the full warrant of Scripture. Exactly in what manner, and by what measures, spiritual beings influence us, is not given us to know. That they so influence us as not to interfere with our moral agency, follows of course from all that God has taught us of our own nature, and of the principles and precepts of true religion. We know that the human mind is susceptible of very strong influences from hope, fear, love, hatred, revenge, &c., and that its principles, views, and operations, are often controlled by extraneous circumstances; and all in perfect consistency with entire freedom of will. There can, therefore, be an influence over the human mind, strong and effectual, without interference with moral agency; an influence, consequently, which may be resisted, and the controlling power of which depends upon its subject himself. And we are too ignorant of the nature and powers of immaterial beings, and of the manner in which they may operate on spirit, even when connected with matter, to venture to deny that such operation can exist. And as this will be kind and beneficial, when proceeding from good, so will it be malignant and injurious, when proceeding from evil beings.

Very frequent references are made in the Bible to the influence of the devil and his angels ouer the hearts of men. St. Paul calls departures "from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;" and says to the Corinthians, "I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils." Deeds of wickedness, committed by men, are denominated works of the devil. He is called "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." In enforcing the duty of repentance, the Scriptures adopt the language, Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. And in almost unnumbered instances, particular acts of sin are ascribed to the influence of Satan: as where he is said to have "entered into Judas" that he might betray his Lord, and to have "filled" the "heart" of "Ananias to lie to the Holy Ghost."

The Scripture view of this, as of every other point, is of course found in the Church. In her services the influence of evil spirits is clearly recognized, and made a subject of humble deprecation. We pray for deliverance from "the deceits of the devil;" that "Satan" may be "beat down under our feet;" and "that those evils which the craft and subtlety of the devil worketh against us may be brought to nought." In baptism, we pray that the newly baptized child or person "may have power and strength to have victory, and to triumph against the devil." And with the same reference, in the visitation of the sick, the pastor prays that "the enemy may have no advantage of him," and that God would "renew in him whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil."

From the view thus afforded of this mysterious part of God's dispensations towards us, it appears that although the sinfulness of our hearts and lives, and our dereliction of duty, will be justly laid to our own charge, and ourselves are justly held responsible and punishable for them; yet they result from the suggestions and temptations, and are sustained by the artifices, of our infernal enemies. We have it in our power, through grace given us, to resist these enemies, and save ourselves from their influence and dominion. Our encouragement of the fraud and malice of the devil is the true cause of his success.

The view of sin thus given should fill us with the greatest abhorrence of it. What is the work of the spirits of darkness, is surely most unworthy of those who pay any regard to the dignity of their nature, and most inconsistent and dangerous in those who acknowledge the obligation to aim at moral and spiritual purity here, and celestial happiness hereafter. The Church, with the greatest reason and propriety, calls those who, by the divinely appointed baptismal means, put on Christ, and name His name, and thus are admitted into His religion, and into covenant with God through Him, to renounce the devil and all his works. They who have entered into this solemn obligation should never dismiss it from their minds, but let it be always present as a principle perpetually operative in drawing them near to God, urging them to a constant seeking of His grace, and inciting them to unwearied effort that, by that grace, they may fulfil aright the momentous responsibility thus resting upon them.

It may be profitable to spend a moment in reflecting on a few of the arts of fraud and malice which the devil usually practises in order to deprive men of the inestimable benefits and pure happiness which the Gospel offers them.

His most conspicuous work is found in the *hardened sinner*, who suffers himself to be so dreadfully deluded as to look for happiness in a bold career of vice. Without remorse or shame, or with but transient feelings of them, we see him, neither fearing God nor honoring man, treading the broad road that leadeth to destruction. And all the while, the temper, rejoicing in the prospect of success, whispers that he is in the way of enjoyment. Profaneness, impiety, deceit, and profligacy, mark his course. Intemperance, blasphemy, and lewdness, blacken his character. The passions of his nature, abused and unrestrained, pervert and degrade it. Him the enemy of souls marks as his prey. By the same vices whereby he brings his nature to an assimilation to his own, he would hasten to bring him to himself, by accelerating that temporal death, which is but the threshold to death eternal. Short as wicked is his course; or if protracted, so but to aggravate his doom. At length, laden with guilt, he goes to his own place, and is given over to the merciless keeping of him to whose arts he yielded, and to whose service he devoted himself. His lot is with the condemned spirits who feel a malignant satisfaction at having brought another into like eternal condemnation with themselves.

This is the fruit of having yielded to the tempter; perhaps, for a while, against the remonstrances of conscience, the friendly caution of advisers, and the checks of religion, shame, or honor.

But the extremity of wickedness often defeats the purpose of the great deceiver. There is something in hardened iniquity so repulsive as to disgust those whose hearts are in the least possessed of delicate or amiable sensibilities. A merely slight regard for the dictates of duty will be some security against wilful declining into flagrant and avowed transgression. There are delusions of the evil one, however, whereby he would fatally practise his arts even in cases thus circumstanced.

When we see persons of amiable minds, of delicate and virtuous sensibilities, treating religion with respect, charitable from sympathy, just from a sense of honor, in general regular in their lives, and commending themselves to the esteem and love of their fellow men; and yet without that supreme love of God; that ardent, self-sacrificing, and active devotion to His service; that meek and humble reception of His teaching; that true evangelical faith, exalting moral virtues into Christian graces; and that regard for eternity, and preference of its concerns to any that time can offer; on which alone the Gospel authorizes us to build our hopes; we are filled with the same affection as was our Master, when He beheld and loved the young man who lacked one thing; and can say that they are not far from the kingdom of God. And such emotions cannot but increase our sorrow that so much excellence should fail in its desired and proper effect, by falling short, through the plausible persuasion of the tempter, of the only rule of duty which man has a right to adopt—the divinely required conditions of salvation. This emphatically warns him not to rest satisfied with mere moral virtue; but to let the dispositions to duty which actuate him in his intercourse with fellow men, be, with the higher and holier heartiness and devotion befitting the OBJECT, consecrated to the doing of all the law and will of God. On any ideas of securing His favor otherwise than by the faith, devotion, and charity of the Gospel, he should look with suspicion, as suggested from no quarter friendly to his eternal interests.

There is no principle of our nature more adapted to the designs of Satan, than selfishness. In religious matters, it deprives them of their holiness, excellence, and tendency to good, and even perverts them to bad and injurious purposes, by causing them to minister to the unblest affections of spiritual pride, jealous comparisons, and mere personal regard. In dealings with fellow men, plausibly abusing the sentiment that a man may do with his own as he will, it dictates that if bare justice be done to others, all their claims are cancelled, and that the principles of benevolence, generosity, and devotion to social and public welfare, are mere creatures of the will, to be admitted and acted upon just as each one sees fit. It encourages forgetfulness, or lures to neglect, of the great moral principles, that all worldly substance is the gift of God; and that He reserves to Himself, and has exercised, the right of requiring that a liberal portion of it shall be used in His service, and for the benefit of our more needy fellow men—a portion so liberal that its appropriation shall be to the giver a real sacrifice, an offering to the original Donor, not without cost to the offerer. To such elevated views of duty, the God of this world, man's malignant spiritual enemy, blinds the miserable beings who grasp and hoard their pelf, careless of what sufferings it may relieve, what blessings it may dispense, what honor and glory it may be the means of bringing to the neglected and insulted Being from whose bounty it has flowed. Satan cares not what sordid enjoyment may thus be found; well knowing the risk they run of the wretched doom had in the Saviour's view, when He said of certain whose satisfactions were mainly selfish and worldly, They *have* their reward; and when He uttered the fearful exclamation, What will it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul!

We read in Holy Scripture that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." With deceitful show of regard for man's spiritual duty and welfare, he boldly pushes the prosecution of his malevolent designs upon our virtue and happiness, even into the sacred inclosure of religion, and finds instruments of deception in its hallowed exercises. In the closet of prayer and meditation, in the sanctuary, and at the altar, he practises his dangerous acts.

Sometimes he has made zeal for religion a pretext for cruel persecution; thus perverting the Gospel of peace and good will into an instrument of violence, suffering, and death; and often, in lesser forms of the bad tempers and dispositions of our nature, he mingles with Christian profession, and even peculiar claims to Christian piety and fidelity, no small infusion of proud disdain, malevolence, and harsh and unkind judgment and conduct.

Here we see the regular observer of the rites and outward exercises of religion, so blinded as to trust to them for recommendation to divine favor, and for claim to the divine goodness. The tempter knows full well that all such religion will perish in the using, leave no blessing behind it, and fail in preparing its subject for the high and holy services of the Church triumphant. Not being animated and controlled by that vital principle of genuine faith in Christ, which sees in Him our only access to the Father, and in all outward observances, but means, to be blessed by and through Him, of that true evangelical piety in which only consists the acceptable service of God; and thus divested of the efficacy of Messiah's intercession; such religion comes not up with approval before our Maker. It returns, unblest, upon its votary, and proves, in all his dependence upon it, but the miserable broken reed which will both fail and wound.

But the emissaries of the prince of darkness assail us also from the opposite point. There is nothing wise and good in Heaven's ordaining which they fail to endeavor to turn to cause of evil. Where minds cannot be brought to a superstitious and ungodly abuse of the sacraments and ordinances of the Church, they must, if possible, be turned from those high and heavenly things, and led to treat them with neglect, or hold them in light esteem. They know that bodily as well as spiritual worship is required of us in the Word of God; and that, constituted as man is, the latter cannot subsist in purity and efficiency without the former. The ministry and sacraments of the Chcrch, and the general principle of worship by rites and ordinances, are as clearly required a part of the Gospel system, as are its faith and inward piety. God has been pleased to join them together, and the arch-rebel against His will has secured abundant proofs in the history of the world, of the ruinous consequences to the latter, of putting them asunder. Be his craft and subtlety utterly rejected and opposed by all good and conscientious Christians. In the evangelical principles and affections which are the life and energy of the Church, let them humbly and devoutly give all diligence in obeying the authority which the Lord has entrusted to her to provide for their walking in all His commandments and ordinances blameless.

We are also lamentably exposed to danger from the dispositions and affections with which we cherish religious feelings, and perform religious duties. If the deceiver succeed in controlling these, his evil designs upon us are very sure of being accomplished. If a mere compliance with custom, if but a cold sense of decency and propriety, if pride, if a desire to be seen and approved of men, if a fondness for the reputation of being more righteous than our neighbor, if a conceit that we are so, if morose and sullen tempers, if a fancy that we are feeling or doing as it is very meritorious for us to feel or do, rule in our hearts, Satan is not discouraged by all the religion we may profess. He will accompany us in our prayers, in our closets, in the temple, at the altar, and suggest thoughts of the good service we are rendering to God, and the claim we are establishing to His favor. He will be with us in our hearing and reading the divine word, and whisper that to us belong the promises, and to others the threatenings, and that others stand more in need than ourselves of its wholesome precepts. He will be with us in our most sacred and retired exercises, and strengthen our belief that our reputation for godliness will increase among men. Even in our professions of unworthiness, and nothingness, and of entire dependence on God, he will soothe us with the assurance that we can never fall from grace, but will certainly be kept, as God's especially favored children, unto everlasting life. And lamentable indeed is the havoc he has made, by this delusion, of both public and personal piety and morality.

From both the boldness, and the cunning craftiness, of our spiritual enemy, the tremendous and absorbing tyranny he would exercise over us, and its small and often remote and hardly perceptible beginnings, we should learn to ponder, constantly and deeply, the kind warning of our Master, when He had in view Satan's great triumph at the last day—WATCH. By very small, by scarcely perceptible beginnings, he commences his work of destruction. If we are not extremely careful to guard the weakest and most susceptible points in our character—and he well knows which they are—he will thither direct his wiles, and omit no arts to gain his malignant ends. The Lord has told us wherein is our only security. It is to be found in the true and living faith of the Gospel, manifested by devout communion with the Church, in the external means of grace and holiness of which she is the divinely commissioned dispenser, and in the uniform, consistent, and uncompromising piety and charity which, according to the will of God, she requires of her children. Thus have we promise that the Holy Ghost will minister to us that effectual grace which will save us from falling a prey to our spiritual enemy, and raise us at last to that eternal removal from his power, and triumph over his failure, in the enjoyment of which we shall sing unceasing hallelujahs for the redeeming love whereby we shall be more than conquerors. B. T. O.

FAITH.

BY RICHARD GRANT WHITE.

In the blessings of this world God has given man no boon dearer than his confidence in his fellows. That implicit trust in all around him which every man who studies the autobiography written on his own heart, can remember to have once possessed, is ever the surest index of a purity which has known no evil, and a happiness which has felt no chill.

What heart that has groaned under the weight of maturity has not longed for the lightness of youth? And yet it is but in this all-trusting confidence that youth is better than maturity; for the cares of manhood are but food for its strength. And so it is that this trusting is to be desired for its own sake, for the very present joy it gives the heart from which it springs. Confidence asks and receives nothing from the world external. Nay, it teaches rather that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Like love, of which it is so essential a part, "it gives itself, but it is not bought." It pours itself out to the world like springing water upcn a thirsty desert, which drains the fount that would gladden it, turns the bright gift to nought but pestilential vapor, and leaves but the scorched channel and the exhausted fountain to tell the wasted blessing. It is the plant whose leaves soonest shrink from the eager grasp of selfishness; the flower whose petals first close under the sky of burning ingratitude. It is the first, the purest, and the brighest jewel which the soul parts with to buy a wisdom which causes disquiet, and a knowledge which brings contamination.

This confidence, when elevated from the erring to the perfect, from the finite to the infinite, from man to God, becomes faith; and with the change attributes are added, and qualities are made inherent in it, which become the purity, the perfection, and the power, on which it is placed. It offers its hand for all eternity, and from eternity comes forth an almighty hand whose pressure is that of boundless love, whose grasp there is no fear to relax, no self-interest to slacken. This faith is as essential to our spiritual, as our confidence is to our temporal happiness. Nay more, for its exercise is the increase of that happiness, while our keenest earthly sorrow is inflicted by violated confidence. Every act of faith is but a stepping-stone to firmer faithfulness; the more we trust our God, the more we long to trust him; while many a confiding act towards our fellows is but one step towards our uncharitable misanthropy, or the dead level of selfish indifference.

God's goodness then, as well as his omniscience, is shown in leaving much to be to us matter of faith, and not of knowledge. His far-seeing love spreads the dark veil on which his almighty will writes, "Thus far and no farther." Here man's justly-boasted reason stops. Here stands the mighty in intellect with the feeble; the man-Christian with the babe in Christ. And who but he who drew the veil can say, if it were lifted, and the eyes which seek to pierce its mysterious folds were allowed to rest on what it hides, whether the hidden might not be the incomprehensible; and the incomprehensible is ever a greater stumbling-block than the unrevealed. Then would the mighty be confounded in his strength, and the feeble overwhelmed in his weakness, the old bewildered in his experience, and the babe lost in its ignorance. Then on the sea of their doubts, and in the tempest of their confusion, would all be lost, because not firmly stayed on the anchor which is within the veil—the faith which is the evidence of things not seen.

But real faith forbids its possessor to seek what God has denied. As the confidence which asks proof is no longer confidence, so the faith which seeks knowledge is no longer faith. Faith must, from its nature, ever be perfect, for trust which is not perfect implies suspicion. Like a solitary column unsupported save by its own base, if strong, it may resist the shock of the earthquake; but while erect it points as duly heavenward in feebleness as in strength, and if it fall from the pride of its strength, it will but sink deeper in the dust which the winds of scepticism have gathered at its base.

And if Faith never realize her belief she is yet to be much sought for the happiness she yields, where else would be dark doubt and troubled suspicion. If she gain us nothing, she loses us nothing; and surely he who enjoys by anticipation is better than he who enjoys not at all. He who gazes on a star and fondly believes it will be the bright home of himself and those he loves, may win laughter at his self-credulity; but is he not happier than the blind, who has no star to look upon?

There are three which are inseparable—Faith, Hope, and Love—but first comes Love, and afterwards Hope, and then Faith is born of these two. And if she have the trust of Love, but be denied his ardor, so she is given the anticipation of Hope without her uncertainty.

Churchman Book and Job Office.

W. H. B. SMITH,

(Successor to H. M. Onderdonk,)

BOOK AND FANCY JOB PRINTER,

No. 11 Spruce street, New York.

BOOK PRINTING, AND BINDING,

done with promptness, and in a style unsurpassed by any in the city of New York.

Checks, Drafts, Notes, Receipts, Bill-Heads, &c.

Executed with neatness and dispatch.

☞ W. H. B. S. having replenished his office with new materials, is prepared to do anything in his line which may be wished. Patronage is most respectfully solicited March 20—tf

BOARDING SCHOOL, SHREWSBURY, N. J.
REV. H. FINCH, Principal.

THE location of this School—in the vicinity of Long-Branch—is one of the most pleasant and healthy in the country—with an easy and daily communication with the city. The Summer term will commence on the 1st of May. For particulars, apply at this office; the bookstore of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, No. 139 Broadway, and at the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, No. 10 John street. March 6—tf

ORGAN MANUFACTORY.
GEORGE JARDINE
Removed to 548 Pearl street, near to and opposite the City Hospital, Broadway, New York.

HAVING, since the destruction by fire of his former Manufactory, secured a large and valuable stock of the best and old seasoned wood, and built every convenience for erecting organs of the largest class, he will be enabled to sustain his long established reputation, and he respectfully solicits extended patronage.

Church, Parlor, and Church Finger and Barrel Organs constantly for sale. August 21.

CHURCH TRIMMINGS.

THE subscribers keep constantly on hand an assortment of Pulpit Trimmings, consisting of Satin and Worsted Damasks, Silk Velvets, and Plusors, with an assortment of Silk Tassells, Fringes, Gimps, and every other article required for Pulpit Trimmings.

Also furnished to order Pew Cushions, either in Hair or Moss. Pews stuffed and lined.

CHARLES McAULEY & CO.,
Upholsterers, 116 Hudson street.
February 27—yly

TO CHURCHES.

THE undersigned having had many years' experience in the Upholstery business, are prepared to execute all orders for the furnishing of Churches with cushions, desk and pulpit trimming, curtains, aisle and chancel carpets, &c., at short notice, and on reasonable terms. Having a large and superior stock of goods always on hand, there will be no delay in fulfilling orders.
may 16—y G. P. & J. GRATACAP, 31 Maiden Lane.

THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES,
Near Hagerstown, Maryland.

THE next Session of this Institution will open on Monday, October 4th—at which time the students in College and in

THE GRAMMAR SCHOOL

should punctually attend. All the usual classes in the Collegiate and the Preparatory Departments are fully organized. Application for further information, or for the admission of Students, to be made to

JOHN B. KERFOOT, Rector.

P. S. A Boarding-house for the accommodation of parents and others visiting the College will be opened on October 1st, immediately adjoining the College grounds.
August 14—8t

ST. PAUL'S COLLEGE.

ST. PAUL'S COLLEGE AND GRAMMAR SCHOOL at College Point, Long Island, will re-open on Monday, October 4th. All applications for the admission of students to be addressed to J. G. Barton, Rector of the College. August 28.

EDUCATION.

REV. R. T. HUDDART'S Classical School will be re-opened after the summer vacation on Monday, September 6th.

Two young lads from the age of 14 to 18 will be received as Private Pupils and Boarders. Terms may be known on application, either personally or by letter, at his residence, 22 East 14th street, between University Place and Fifth Avenue.
August 21—is4t.

THE COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, 95 Mercer street, will be re-opened on Monday, the 30th August.

The 27th Annual Circular containing terms for Boarding and Day Scholars, can be obtained at the bookstores of Mr. R. Carter, corner of Mercer and Canal streets, and at Leavett and Trows, corner of Dey and Broadway.

FORREST & McELLIGOTT,
August 28—6t Principals.

ORGANS FOR SALE—St. Mark's Church Organ. Inquire of the Sexton, Mr. Disbrow.

Also, three Gothic Organs, just finished.

Two Grecian cased Organs.

A second hand Church Organ, and an assortment of Parlor Organs.

For further particulars inquire of
HENRY ERBEN, 172 Centre street.
July 17—yl

Just Published, for August.

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN'S MISCELLANY. A Journal for the Young, containing religious and instructive matter, and illustrated with choice Engravings, Small 8vo., 42 pp. Edited by Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M., author of "The Christian Instructed in the ways of the Gospel and the Church." Published regularly on the first of every month, at 191 Broadway. Price $1 50 per annum. July 11—yl.

CHURCH OR TOWN CLOCKS.

RANSOM SMITH, 71-2 Bowery, New York, manufactures a beautiful and substantial article of Steeple Clock—with jewelled (agate) Escapement, steel Pinions and Retaining Power—warranted, when well put up, not to vary half a minute in a month, which he will sell as cheap as the same quality of clock can be purchased in the world. Also an elegant and superior circular Timepiece, for the inside of churches, banks, offices, stores, &c. &c.

He will also furnish church bells as cheap and as good as can be obtained elsewhere.

Individuals and committees are invited to call and see.
August 28—6m$

SKIFF'S PATENT METALIC SARCOPHAGUS,
OR AIR TIGHT COFFIN.

THE attention of the public is invited to this important discovery and improvement, in which the Patentee has succeeded in producing, by a combination of metals, an indestructable material, applicable to the formation of Coffins, Boxes, &c., for the preservation of animal or other perishable substances.

Cast and wrought iron having proved incapable of being made air tight for any length of time, and liable to rapid oxidation, the experiment of galvanizing with zinc was resorted to and for some time excited considerable attention in Europe, but like every other attempt of the kind resulted in a failure; it is now considered of little value for that purpose, and is entirely useless in our climate of extreme heat and cold. It is confidently believed, that this is the only material possessing strength to resist the atmospheric pressure when exhausted, and durability to give it any advantage over the ordinary Wooden Coffin.

The materials of which the Coffins are composed being impervious to air, the body should be immediately deposited and heremetically enclosed; the air can then be exhausted and the subject preserved for an unlimited time with perfect security against contagion, even from smallpox or any other malignant disease. The necessity for immediate interment is entirely obviated, as it can remain without the possibility of any unpleasant effluvia being emitted, affording an opportunity for absent relatives and friends of participating in the performance of the last solemn duties to the deceased.

It also admits of its being transported from any one part of the Country or Globe to any other, either by sea or land, and when deposited in its final resting place, it can at any time be readily recognized, and not liable in the breaking up of Cemetries or removal of the dead to be scattered abroad. When placed in a vault it can at all times be visited without any unpleasantness but such as may arise from sympathy; thus accomplishing with little or no increased expense what for past ages has been attempted in vain. By economy in finishing, the price of the Sarcophagus will be so reasonable as to place it within the reach of all classes who are desirous of preserving the remains of their friends from rapid decay, and from being mingled with that of others. Boxes for the preservation of fruits, water tanks, pipes, and indeed every other description of work to which iron is applied in exposed situations, can be made of this composition at a very trifling additional expense to that in ordinary use. Samples will be ready and may be seen on Monday next at No. 20 Canal street, near Broadway, and at Damerest & Munn's, No. 2 Wall street, corner of Broadway.

August 21. 6t. EDWARD DOYLE, Agent.

RYDAL MOUNT SEMINARY FOR BOYS,
CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

FEW of the delightful mansions for which the vicinity of Boston is distinguished, are possessed of more attractions than the one which has been secured for this Institution. It is distant but ten minutes' walk from the central part of the City of Boston, whilst the extensive grounds around it, abounding in fruit and shade trees, impart to it the united charms of elegance and seclusion.

The course of instruction will include every branch which pertains to an accomplished education. Special attention will be given to the formation of manners, which are the result of habits rather than precepts. The pupils, with their Teachers, are regular attendants at St. John's Church, (Episcopal.)

The health of the pupils is most carefully attended to—the regular exercise—the abundant and wholesome food—and the salubrious situation of the School, are the main causes which conduce to this end, and are found so effectual that the advice of a physician is scarcely ever required. The INSTITUTION is abundantly furnished with all "appliances and means" which may conduce to the amusement and recreation of the boys, out of school hours Gymnastics, Gardening, &c. &c., form a portion of their more athletic occupations; while for stormy weather, and in-door amusements, every facility is offered for making the time pass in such a manner as to keep the powers of the body and mind in constant and healthy exercise. The whole establishment is made to resemble, as nearly as possible, a large, well regulated family.

Pupils are received at any age over eight years. It is preferred to have them sent at as early an age as convenient, in order that they may receive the full benefit of the course of instruction and moral training pursued in this establishment.

Boarding and tuition in the English branches and the Classics, per year, $200.

A long list of References, of the highest respectability, in Boston and the vicinity, may be seen by any who are disposed to patronize the School.

Circulars may be seen at the office of The Churchman.
T. B. CLOUGH, *Principal.*
E. W. ABBOTT, *Superintendant.*
Rev. WM. WITHINGTON, *Teacher of the Classics.*
F. B. CASAS, *Teacher of Spanish.*
A. AURAY, *Teacher of French and Drawing.*
Mrs. LOUISA PATTERSON, *Matron.*
June 26—3m

MRS. OKILL having announced in her School Circular, July 10, 1847, a departure from what has been, for many years, the *School Term* of her establishment,—taking for it the period between Snpt. 1st and June 30th, instead of as formerly, from Sept. 15th to July 31st,—here presents, to the parents and guardians of her pupils, the following reasons for it.

1. The custom among some heads of families of spending, with their children, a part of the summer in the country, which, formerly limited to a few, and confined to a short period, is now almost general, and extends in many cases, through the entire months of July and August, has, with it, introduced corresponding modifications in domestic and business relations of all kinds; and in none have changes, to meet the salutary habit, become more indispensable than in school arrangements; in the well-working of which so much depends upon keeping the classes together, to attain through instruction, and to promote a healthful emulation.

2. The *necessity* for a systematic and uniform course, presenting to the mind of instructor and pupil equally a character of oneness, in which a well defined goal must be reached before completeness can be attained, is in no department of life more urgent than in that of instruction. Without this characteristic, education looses its chief end: *the establishment of orderly habits of mind and body, and the faculty of bendtng, at pleasure, the powers of each to the will.* How far unbroken attendance upon school duties, until their completion, must tend to fix these habits, and to prevent the formation of their opposites, and particularly to the one most fatal to the comfort of the individual as well as of others—*desultoriness*—need not be insisted on with any well-informed person.

3. The bond of sympathy between instructor and pupil, which, although to some it may seem of minor consideration, is of truly great importance, both to moral and intellectual development, is greatly strengthened by the two remaining together during the entire course. If the pupil knows she may be taken from school at any moment, and the instructor has the same prospect, the one is kept in a state of mind the least teachable, aud most unfavorable to steady application, whilst the other is as naturally rendered anxious, lest the sole reward that can compensate for the wearisome toil of teaching, the consciousness of having been instrumental in fulfilling the hopes of parents, by presenting to them a well trained mind, may unthinkingly be snatched away when nearly earned.

No. 8 Clinton Place, New-York August 5th, 1847.

☞ School will be opened Wednesday, Sept. 1, 1847.
August 14—7t

CHURCH SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES,
UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.
Miss AYRES, Principal.
No. 54 West Twentieth street, New York.

THE Fall Term of this Institution will commence on the 15th of September. A Prospectus of the School may be obtained of the Rev. W. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., No. 110 Twentieth street; of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, No. 139 Broadway; and at the Depository of the Sunday School Union, No. 20 John street.

REFERENCES.

L. M. Hoffman, Esq., J. H. Swift, Esq., W. F. Cary, Esq., Govr. M. Wilkins, Esq., W. H. Aspinwall, Esq., R. B. Minturn, Esq., Murray Hoffman, Esq, Hamilton Wilkes, Esq. July 17—tf

MR. YOUNG'S
ENGLISH AND CLASSICAL INSTITUTE,
No. 1 Abingdon Square, corner of Bank st.

THIS School which has for nearly three years been located at No. 88 Fourth street, will be removed on the first of May, to the large and pleasant house, No. 1 Abingdon Square. The rooms will be fitted up and furnished with all the comforts of private parlors.

In addition to a thorough course of English and Classical instruction, the principal modern languages, drawing, vocal music, &c., are taught by competent instructors.

Terms—from $10 to $15 per quarter, without extra charges for any studies. Two or three pupils will be admitted into the Principal's family as boarding scholars, at a charge of $200 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.

Circulars containing particulars, references, &c., may be had till 1st of May at 88 Fourth street.
March 27—tf

CHURCH CUSHIONS, PULPIT FURNITURE, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfullly inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making Furniture for, and Trimmings of, Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,
aug. 3—y 449 Broadway.

BOOKBINDING.

THE Subscriber respectfully informs the public that he continues to carry on the above business in all its branches. All orders punctually attended to.

Reference is made to the following gentlemen—Messrs Sanford & Swords, at whose store orders may be left Rev. Drs. Seabury, Anthon, Taylor, Higbee, and Smith J. M. Wainwright, W. A. Muhlenberg, John S. Rogers, Esq., 194 Fulton.
September 5—yly WILLIAM ASHKETTLE.

BOOK AND FANCY JOB PINRTING neatly executed at this office.

☞ *At reduced prices for Cash only* ☜

Published and for sale by

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository No. 20 John street, New York:

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION

Union Primer,	per hundred,	$2 00
Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1,	"	1 25
" " " No. 2,	"	1 50
" " " No. 3,	"	1 75
" " " No. 4,	"	3 50
Questions on the Sunday School Books,	"	4 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,)	"	1 25
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 00
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,	"	4 00
Beaven's Help to Catechizing,	"	6 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	2 50
Church Catechism,	"	1 00
First Truths,	"	2 00
Duty to God,	"	50
Church Primer,	"	1 25
Sunday School Liturgy, and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	"	1 50
Harmony of the Creeds,	"	2 00
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 00
Collects from the Prayer Book,	"	1 50
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	6 00
Catechism on the Collects,	"	20 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	6 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, Parts 1 and 2, stiff covers	"	8 00
Manual of Oral Instruction upon the Bible,	"	2 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child, with answers in the words of Scripture,	"	2 00
The History of our Blessed Lord, in Easy Verse,	"	6 00
Bible Companion, vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	18 00
" " vol. 2, New "	"	20 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff cov.,	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	6 00
Questions on the Acts, 1, "	"	6 00
" " 2, "	"	6 00
" " 3, "	"	5 00

NEW BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM SIMPLIFIED, *by Questions and Answers*, $3 00.

SCRIPTURE READING LESSONS *for Young children*, $6

☞ A discount of 10 per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools, auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

CHEAP LIBRARY. *One Hundred Volumes* bound, with muslin backs, and containing 158 books, put up by direction of the Executive Committee, for TEN DOLLARS This is believed to be the cheapest Library in th country.

THE LIBRARY to this date, in 167 vols., of various prices. Total, $24,44 nett.

THE CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 36 vols., of 144 pages each. Price for the set, $6,48 nett.

THE JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols., 32 mo. Price for the set, 87 cents nett.

BEAUTIFUL BOOKS FOR GIFTS.
In quarto form, upon superfine paper.

THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS. An Allegory By the Rev. Wm. Adams. With elegant illustrations. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cents; fancy paper covers, 25 cents.

THE DISTANT HILLS. An Allegory. By the same author. Similarly illustrated. Muslin, gilt, 62 1-2 cts.

SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross, and The Distant Hills, in 1 vol. Muslin, gilt, $1.

THE DARK RIVER. An Allegory. By the Rev. Edward Munro. With 4 elegant illustrations. Muslin, 62 1-2 cents.

THE HISTORY OF OUR BLESSED LORD. In Easy Verse. With beautiful lithographic illustrations, &c. Muslin 50 cents; fancy paper covers, 31 cents.

THE CASTLE ON THE ROCK. With a fine wood engraving. Muslin, 25 cents; fancy paper covers, 12 1-2 cents.

FIDELIS, THE SOLDIER OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE. An Allegory. With a fine engraving. Fancy paper, 8 cents.

NEW LIBRARY BOOKS.

LUKE SHARP. A Tale of Modern Education,	half morocco,	34 cents
THE DARK RIVER,	" " " "	30 "
THE FALL OF CRŒSUS	" " " "	31 "
THE CRIPPLE OF THE RAILROAD,	"	15 "
THOMAS KENMIR.	" " " "	12 "
GOTTFRIED, or THE ISLAND HERMITAGE,		23 "
THE CASTLE OF FALKENBOURG,	"	15 "
HISTORY OF CHARLES JONES,	" "	10 "
PRASCA LOUPOULOFF, or Filial Piety Exemplified,		18 "
BAD HABITS,		10 "

PERIODICAL.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, *monthly publication*, 24 pages, 18mo—single, 25 cents per annum, and fifty copies for $10—payable always in advance.

☞ Address all orders for Books, and all remittances to DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,
may 16 Church Depository, 20 John street.

THE MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.
No. 56 Wall street.

Nett amount of accumulated premiums invested in mortgages and N. Y. State and City Stocks and U. S. Government, $376,282,20.

THIS Company is organized on the purely mutual principle, and its business is restricted by the charter to the insurance of lives, and granting annuities and endowments, and now ranks among the strongest and safest institutions in this country. The whole of the profits inure to the benefit of the policy holders. An extensive and prosperous business promises large dividends on the first division of profits on the 1st February, 1848, and persons now insuring will share in these profits if they survive that perlod.

The premiums are paid annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, if desired, and are as low as any American Company, and lower than the English, with a participation in the profits. Policy holders are secured by investments in bond and mortgages on real estate in the city of New York and Brooklyn, worth double the amount loaned thereon, and in stocks of the State and city of New York, and of the United States.

The transactions of this Company are on the cash principle; consequently the survivors of parties insuring with it will not be subjected to the heavy drawback of accumulated premium notes, reducing the benefit of the assurance to a small pittance.

Persons may effect insurance on their own lives and the lives of others. A married woman can insure the life of her husband, which will inure to her sole use and that of her children.

Pamphlets explanatory of the principles of Mutual Life Insurance, and illustrating its advantages, with forms of application, may be obtained at the office of the Company, 56 Wall street, or of any of its agents.

TRUSTEES.

Morris Robinson,	Alfred Pell,
William J. Hyslop,	David C. Colden,
R. H. McCurdy,	John C. Thatcher,
Frederick S. Winston,	Rufus L. Lord,
C. W. Faber,	William Betts,
Mortimer Livingston,	Joseph Blunt,
Theodore Sedgwick,	Isaac G. Pearson,
Stacy B. Collins.	William Barnewall,
John H. Swift,	William Moore,
Jos. B. Collins,	Zebedee Cook,
James S. Wadsworth	Jonathan Miller,
Henry W. Hubbell,	Fitz Green Halleck,
Gouverneur M. Wilkins,	Robert Schuyler,
John V. L. Pruyn,	Amos S. Perry,
Frederick Whittlesey,	Joseph Tuckerman,
Charles Ely,	Gidnon Hawley,
John C. Cruger,	Wm. J. Bunker,
Walter Joy,	One vacancy.

MORRIS ROBINSON, President.
SAMUEL HANNAY, Secretary.
MINTURN POST, M.D., Physician to the Com'y.
JOS. BLUNT, Solicitor. 504 Broadway
May 22—tf

BOARDING and Day School for Young Ladies, at West Farms, Westchester county, New York.

The Spring Term will commence on the 12th of April, at which time Mrs. Wilkins will again be ready to receive a limited number of pupils as boarders. Those parents who may favor her with the care of their children may be assured that every attention will be paid to their happiness as well as to their education. The village of West Farms is healthy, and at the convenient distance of eleven miles from New York, from which place it is rendered easy of access by the Harlem Rail-road and stages from Morrisania.

For particulars apply personally, or by letter, addressed to Mr. Isaac Wilkins, West Farms.

Circulars may be obtained at the Churchman office, 12 John street. Feb. 27—tf

THE CHURCHMAN
DEVOTED TO THE UNITED INTERESTS OF THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH.
PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,
AT NO. 12 JOHN STREET, UP STAIRS,
REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D., EDITOR

"The Executive Committee" consists of the following persons:—Floyd Smith, Chairman; John H. Swift, John C. Thatcher, David Hubbell Hoyt, and Benjamin A. Mumford. Until otherwise announced all communications on BUSINESS AFFAIRS may be addressed to the Chairman, No. 12 John street.